

THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. 5.

OCTOBER, 1891.

No. 1.

FOR THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

ORGANIC UNION VS. INTER-DENOMINATIONAL FRATERNITY.

BY REV. GEORGE P. HAYS, D.D., KANSAS CITY, MO., EX-MODERATOR OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

It is so fashionable now to advocate church unity that anything on the other side is apt to be received with serious prejudice. He must expect to be denounced as uncharitable if not unchristian who shall venture to assert that in the present imperfect state of Christian sanctification the present condition of the Protestant world is fairly satisfactory, and for important reasons that condition is much to be preferred to any condition at present attainable in one consolidated organization. In this rage for church unity one denomination by its highest authority has issued a public manifesto advising everybody to unite with it; another denomination has in its highest court a large committee on church unity and federation, and another large committee on church comity, and almost every denomination has the subject up in its various judicatories in one shape or another. All this sentiment is greatly intensified by the enthusiasm of certain gushing people who always attend interdenominational conventions, and whose stock address consists in lamenting divisions in the body of Christ, and in applauding all interdenominational organizations, such as Young Men's Christian Associations, the International and State Sabbath-School Associations, the Y. P. S. C. E. Conventions, the Sabbath Associations, the Tract Societies, the Temperance Associations, etc., because these are leading the way to that happy day when all the denominations shall become one organic body. These gushing enthusiasts seem to hold that one denominational form must be divine and right, and that therefore every other is wrong, and all division is necessarily the sin of schism. With these one passage of Scripture is always quoted with an air of self-conscious assurance, as if it was the conclusive and overwhelming proof that

settled the whole question. That passage underlies the proposition of the House of Bishops for church unity on the basis of the Scriptures, the two sacraments, the Nicene Creed, and the historic Episcopate. The passage is John xvii. 21: "That they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me."

But does it justify any such application? The first clause of that verse is not a sentence by itself. It is not a statement true irrespective of its connection. It is part of an argument accompanied by an illustration and leading to a conclusion. Do the illustration and preceding premise and succeeding conclusion justify the conviction that the unity there mentioned is the organic, external unity of Christians in contradistinction to the unity and fraternity that now exist between the denominations of Evangelical Christians? The chapter contains the Lord's intercessory prayer for His people; and at verse 20 He enlarges His petition to include not only those that already have believed, but also those who "shall believe on Me through their word: that they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me." Now a Unitarian may truly say that this means church unity without distinction of denomination, just as a Unitarian believes that the oneness of the Godhead is unity without distinction of persons. But the very pivot of the belief of the Trinitarian is that in the Godhead there is spiritual and substantial unity, while between the different persons of the Godhead there is distinction of personality and office work and relationship. Surely those who quote that verse do not mean

that it is essential that all external distinctions shall be obliterated between the Church and the Godhead, as according to their interpretation would seem to be meant by the phrase "that they also may be one *in us*." By what system of organic union can it be made out that the various Christians shall be in *each other* as the Father is in the Son and the Son in the Father?

The result prayed for is that the world may be convinced of the presence of Christ in the Church, and thereby be satisfied that Christ was sent of the Father. Formal unity in the shape of organic consolidation would, however, prove precisely the reverse of that which is here suggested. Dead uniformity is not the mark of the work of the Divine Hand. God's plan is external variety with a presence of essential unity. All plants have a similar life, but species differ from species. One species is no more a plant because of its specific peculiarities, nor less a plant because of its specific distinctions. Neither animals nor men are made alike by the Divine Hand. For reasons that are not apparent large numbers of individual birds and beasts will separate themselves from the other members of their own species into their own favorite flocks; and this separation into herds is not to the injury of either the particular drove or the general mass. In some cases these gregarious selections among men have an explanation, but in other cases they are due to inexplicable matters of taste. These denominational differences in the preferences of individual Christians may in some cases have no good reason; in other cases they may greatly tend to Christian growth, personal comfort and spiritual sanctification.

Men often say that the division of the Church into denominations is a great hindrance to outsiders in their attention to religion. Hundreds of outsiders make these divisions the plausible excuse for their neglect. But it is to be noted that no Scripture, either of instruction or example, any more than human experience, gives good ground to believe that this is a fact. The very people who make these differences between the denominations excuses for the neglect of the whole subject would find some other excuse if this was taken away. God, on His own authority, made distinctions for the better organization of His people, when there was no object for it but their good. Even in the wilderness the Israelites were organized into tribes; and when settled in Canaan this division was kept up. Surely no one will say that Benjamin and Judah and the rest should all

have been consolidated into one tribe for every purpose. There were twelve apostles; and Paul's objection to the divisions in Corinth was that the attempt was made to make Paul and Cephas and Apollos substitutes for Christ. The Old Testament synagogues were adopted as the model of the New Testament churches; and even in the same cities there were numerous synagogues, as in all the history of the New Testament churches there have been numerous congregations in the same neighborhood.

The evils which are proposed to be remedied by this union of denominations are far more serious as among individual churches than among denominations; and if to remedy these it is important to consolidate denominations, it will be still more important to consolidate congregations. The competition with one another for the favor and patronage of individual persons and families is much more active between individual churches than between the denominations. It is due largely to lack of good sense on the part of the individuals, and their stock of common sense would not be increased by putting them into the same denomination. Nine tenths of the evils of this competition, as it is generally described, exists only in the imagination of the enthusiastic orator, as he describes how other people would work if their souls were no larger than his own. As a fact interdenominational disputes, heated controversies, and angry debates do not exist. They never did exist to the extent to which they have been described. They exist to-day as earnestly in the jealousy and competition and backbiting of ministers and church-members in competing congregations in the same denomination as they ever did between the denominations. The remedy proposed in organic union, even if tried, would therefore be most disappointing.

The theory that external, organic unity is obligatory on the Church, and that every division is schism, is not only unscriptural and inefficient as a remedy for the evils it seeks to cure, but is destructive to the freedom and efficiency of the Church. When that theory becomes dominant, those in power become omnipotent. Whether that power is in the hands of a majority or in the hands of a single individual, it is equally destructive to the influence and freedom of minorities. When Pope Pius IX. proposed to declare in behalf of the Roman Church its belief in the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, thousands of their ablest scholars and bishops remon-

strated. were only an effort Church to start had the and under unity the cepted th lieving i Concepti the Pop Pope wa claimed Concept

Precis knew th they wo would b sion. E the wor is meas duct of countrie drunken fly the narrowe denomin sponsibi nation. govern escape f ous resp not reli gregatic learned moral a tions. only re pression dened o to whic on the e nomina tians ha to a com of resp dissatis other c govern nomina presenc the Son tely P is now being i maxim ments c admini But i of the

strated. Döllinger and others like him were only kept from breaking away to make an effort to establish the "Old Catholic Church" by a plea that this would only be to start another denomination. The Pope had the power and the prelates had not; and under the plea of maintaining external unity the Roman priesthood and people accepted the position before the world, of believing in the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception because of the infallibility of the Pope, when, in fact, they knew the Pope was not infallible because he had proclaimed the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception.

Precisely so it is with majorities. If they knew that however minorities protested they would do nothing but submit, no limit would be put to their overbearing oppression. Even in the broad sense in which the word Christian is used, each Christian is measurably held responsible for the conduct of every other Christian. In heathen countries Christians are often judged by the drunken sailors that come in the ships which fly the flags of Christian nations. In the narrower sense each individual member of a denomination must accept a measure of responsibility for the position of his denomination. The independent form of church government makes the nearest approach to escape from this oftentimes extremely odious responsibility. Yet independency does not relieve from responsibility, as the Congregational and Baptist churches have learned when they come to deal with immoral and sceptical pastors and congregations. As a practical issue, therefore, the only reasonable solution by which the oppression of universal formal unity is burdened on the one hand, and the temptations to which non-church-membership is exposed on the other, is in the present state of denominational coherence by which Christians having a common belief and agreeing to a common government, accept their share of responsibility for each other; and when dissatisfied take their membership to that other denomination whose doctrine and government they prefer. With these denominational distinctions the indwelling presence of the Deity, as the Father is in the Son and the Son in the Father, is entirely possible, and to a very large extent is now realized, with a possibility of its being intensified until it finally reaches the maximum, while yet the differences of statements of denominational beliefs and organic administration are maintained.

But it is often asked, Will not the Church of the millennium be a single denomina-

tion, and the divisions into denominations which now exist disappear as the final and perfect form of the Church manifests itself? Even if this was true it would be no argument that in the present imperfect state of the Church it ought to take on forms and methods which would be practicable in its perfect state. The very defence made in behalf of nude art and absolute communism is that neither clothing nor individual property existed before the fall, nor will they be needed when mankind cease their sin and selfishness. At present, however, sin and selfishness are as real facts as winters and diseases and hunger. Animals eat what nature provides without cooking; but men cannot avoid starvation without working. The question is not what would be the condition of things and the possibilities of society under different circumstances, with people constituted physically and morally wholly different from what the race now is, but what is best physically, socially, and religiously now that winters chill us and fevers burn us and human infirmities make religious life a struggle and religious peace a problem. Many good people get along fairly well together so long as they do not undertake to live in the same house. It may be said that they ought to be able to live in the same house, but the quarrels that would result from compulsion would be a poor compensation for the peace attained by each having his own house. So, remembering the differing tastes of Christians as to modes of worship and baptism and prayer and preaching, and the differing beliefs about non-essential details of Christian faith, consolidation of all into one denomination and the compulsion of all to abide by a common rule would only hinder Christian growth and destroy Christian peace. The plan is not God's plan in the first place; and in the second place, if it was God's plan for perfectly sanctified Christians, it would not be practicable now with imperfectly sanctified people until God gets done this sanctifying process.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

BY PROFESSOR EMIL SCHÜRER, D.D., KIEL, GERMANY.

From *The Contemporary Review* (London), September, 1891.

THE application of the historico-critical method to the books of the Bible appears to many pious Christians even to-day as an

attack of scepticism on the Divine word. That these writings, which are plainly regarded as "the Word of God," should be analysed and judged in the same way as other ancient documents is in principle not permissible. The attempt to justify Biblical criticism is regarded as an antagonism betwixt faith and unbelief.

In the circle of educated scientific theologians there are, indeed, very few who now represent this standpoint. The most orthodox believers can no longer disregard the fact that even the Biblical writings are literary productions from the hand of man, which have arisen under conditions quite similar to those of other ancient documents, and are, therefore, to be examined after the same method. The recognition of this fact has brought about a change in the Protestant Church and Theology, greater than any other since the end of last century, and there will be no going back. But, although Biblical criticism is definitely recognised in the circles of scientific theology as right *in principle*, unprejudiced and thorough *application* of the principle is far from complete. Many, indeed most, theologians are still in the mood which we have already indicated as that of the pious laity. The attitude assumed towards Biblical criticism is still one of continuous mistrust, and there is always an inclination to treat the questions which arise, not as questions of historical science, but as questions of faith to be determined by the postulates of faith.

What is here said is true in an exceptional degree of the question respecting the *origin of the Fourth Gospel*. It is certainly one of the most important, indeed the most important, of all the questions that engage New Testament criticism. If the account in the Fourth Gospel be unhistorical, and if we must use the Synoptics exclusively as the source of Gospel history, then the picture of the active life of Jesus will be essentially different from that obtained if we may unconditionally trust the Gospel of the beloved disciple as an authentic source. This undeniable circumstance is, however, regarded by many as though it were simply a question of faith, as though the Christian creed would suffer shipwreck if the Apostle John was not the author of the Fourth Gospel, and as though the authenticity of the Gospel were merely disputed in the interests of unbelief. The history of the newer criticism has taught us, in an ever increasing degree, how untenable is this conception. The more thoroughly and earnestly the peculiar character of the Fourth Gospel has been investigated the more fully

have those difficulties which attend the acceptance of its historical character, or its Apostolic origin, been recognised by theologians, who were by no means of the unbelieving or negative type. It is more and more clearly seen that the question treated is not one touching our faith, but a problem of historical investigation. We have not yet advanced so far that the opponents can shake hands; but we are on the way. The defenders of the Apostolic origin admit increasingly, that the account given in the Fourth Gospel is not strictly historical; and the opponents are ready to acknowledge the possibility, indeed the probability, that in some degree an independent historical tradition echoes on in it. The discussions have therefore, passed from the arena of religious strife into the quieter atmosphere of scientific deliberation. May one hope that an understanding will be reached at no distant period? If all signs do not deceive us, this goal, so far as a wide circle of Protestant theologians is concerned, is not very far off. For even apart from this particular question the conviction gains ground that the stability of the Christian faith is not dependent on the question of the genuineness or the circumstances of the origin of the Biblical writings. It is certain that Christian faith existed long before the rise of the New Testament Scriptures, and therefore certain that the Christian faith is not faith in the Bible, but faith in the grace of God in Jesus Christ.

I.

The first attacks on the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel arose towards the end of the last and at the beginning of the present century among the Deists in England, and in Germany among the representatives of the Illumination (*Aufklärung*—revival of philosophical and theological thought). They brought forth hardly anything which is of importance to-day. Yet one work must be named with honour—a work which attracted attention for the first time so as to command observation to the points which were decisive for criticism—C. Th. Bretschneider's "*Probabilia de Evangelii et Epistolarum Joannis Apostoli indole et origine*" (Lipsiae, 1820). Bretschneider even then, like all modern critics, laid chief emphasis on the difference between the Johannine and Synoptic sayings of Christ. This appears to him so great that he does not think the former can be accepted as the reports of an eye- or ear-witness. But the most of the other difficulties—the univer-

salistic
the Gre
author
know of
lack of
presente
He belie
basis for
the Gos
that the
tolic Ch

Bretsch
tentio
flood of
it. Bu
There v
then a g
indeed,
ments v
general
an impr
and sub
The au
great in
in the f
logian l
express
Apostol
The "t
sive; th
not hav
ilarity h
Plato an
informe
deeper i
relation
Synopti
pler and
whilst t
let us a
confide
vouches
nine Go
Even so
clared w
nine aut
even if
the aut
tribute
ciple, ju
ner of
count, a
acter.†

About
duction
Fourth

* "Add
episcopi
Testament
Schleierma
† "Intro

salistic standpoint of freedom from the law, the Greek and philosophical training of the author in comparison with that which we know of the Apostle John, the comparative lack of external evidence—Bretschneider presented then essentially in correct form. He believed that he had thus laid adequate basis for the conclusion that the author of the Gospel could not be an Apostle, but that the work must be that of a post-Apostolic Christian of Greek training.

Bretschneider's book attracted great attention in its time in Germany. Quite a flood of writings appeared in opposition to it. But no permanent effect resulted. There was first an energetic advance and then a general retreat followed. It cannot, indeed, be said that Bretschneider's arguments were actually answered. But the general opposition he met with made such an impression on himself, that he wavered and subsequently withdrew his opinion. The authority of Schleiermacher was of great influence in the formation of opinion in the following decades. This great theologian had taken several opportunities to express himself decidedly in favour of the Apostolic origin of the Fourth Gospel.* The "total impression" was for him decisive; the Johannine picture of Christ could not have been invented. There was a similarity here to the portrayal of Socrates by Plato and Xenophon. The sober Xenophon informed us more about externals, but Plato, deeper in mind, initiated us into the inner relationship of the Socratic ideas. So the Synoptics informed us only about the simpler and easily grasped sayings of Jesus, whilst the beloved disciple of kindred soul let us see into the heart of Jesus. The confidence with which Schleiermacher vouched for the authenticity of the Johannine Gospel ruled opinion for a generation. Even so moderate a critic as Credner declared with real enthusiasm for the Johannine authorship. He ventured to say that even if we possessed no tradition respecting the author, we should be compelled to attribute the composition to the beloved disciple, judging simply from the whole manner of the Gospel, the vividness of its account, and its theological and literary character.†

About the same time as Credner's Introduction appeared the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel was again disputed, but the

attacks were so summary and superficial as to make no marked impression.*

New lines were struck here, as were also in the whole province of New Testament criticism by the celebrated founder of the Tübingen school, Ferdinand Christian Baur. His epoch-making investigations respecting the Johannine Gospel appeared first in the "Theological Jahrbücher" for 1844, and then in "Critical Investigations regarding the Canonical Gospels" (1847). Baur's criticism was fruitful in that he did not put the question of "genuine or not" in the foreground, but strove first of all to understand the peculiar nature, and the object and literary character of the New Testament writings generally, and of the Fourth Gospel in particular. The key to the understanding of the latter he discovered in the prologue, for the whole presentation of the history was only a free unfolding of the fundamental thoughts expressed there. The world is the kingdom of darkness. By the entry into the world of the divine Logos, arises the conflict between light and darkness. This conflict is not absolute, for there are men in the world susceptible to the "divine light." These accept the Logos, and he makes them God's children. The Logos has always exercised his activity even before becoming flesh. But in an exceptionally intensive way he has exercised it as the Incarnate One. As such he has revealed divine light and life in sensuous form. Thereby the invitation has become more pressing on the one side, and the rejection less excusable on the other. His incarnation brings not only salvation for one, but judgment for another. And the Gospel does not seek to do other than show how, through the self-sacrifice of the incarnate divine Logos, the process of separation fulfils itself. It simply seeks to present this dogmatic idea. The presentation of the history is only a means to this end, and it therefore treats the particulars of the historical tradition with absolute freedom. It is far more like the drama of a poet than the work of an historian. Untroubled about the particulars of the tradition, it sets forth how, according to the presuppositions, the process fulfils itself. The Logos reveals himself from the first in his full glory, in the centre of the Jewish world, in Judæa. He thereby attracts some, the mass he repels. By ceaseless advance of His self-revelation and continuously

* "Addresses on Religion to the Educated among its Dispersers." Third edition (with notes), 1821. "Lecture on New Testament Introduction" (delivered 1829-32), published after Schleiermacher's death. 1845.

† "Introduction to New Testament" (1836), p. 208.

* Strauss, "Life of Jesus," 2 vols. 1835. Bruno Bauer, "Criticism of John's Gospel History," 1840. Lützelberger, "Ecclesiastical Tradition respecting the Apostle John," 1840.

renewed proofs of His divine glory, the catastrophe eventually arises in which Jesus proves Himself victor over death and darkness. All deviations of the Fourth Gospel from the Synoptics Baur believes are to be explained from this fundamental idea. But all these deviations he counts at the same time deviations from actual fact, originating entirely in the Evangelist's free poetic licence. So, according to Baur, it is easily seen that the Gospel cannot be by an Apostle. He finds this confirmed by the whole theological standpoint of the Evangelist who is no Jewish Christian and legalist like the Apostle John, but a Gentile Christian and Universalist. The Gospel indeed presupposes the whole development which early Christianity passed through up to the middle of the second century—the reconciliation of the opposition between Jewish Christianity and Paulinism in the higher unity of the Catholic Church, the rise of Gnosticism, of Montanism, and of the discussions respecting the Lord's Supper. It seeks to lay hold of all these movements and currents, and rule them from its own standpoint, and cannot therefore have arisen earlier than in the second half of the second century.

In Baur's positions there is, perhaps, as much right as wrong. Valuable views, which cannot be lost again, respecting the object and plan of the Fourth Gospel were disclosed by him. But a satisfactory explanation of all points had not yet been given. The attempt to explain all deviations from the Synoptics as free productions of the imagination on the basis of the theological plan of the Evangelist, without recognition of any sort of historical tradition which may have been at his disposal, cannot be described as successful. And the late date of composition assigned—after the rise of Montanism and the discussions respecting the Lord's Supper—may be shown to be impossible by external testimony. If it be added that Baur produced a shock in other spheres of New Testament criticism by his daring negations, it will be easily understood that he met at first with almost universal opposition. The impression was given of a revolutionary radicalism against which it is necessary to protest with energy. In fact more than twenty years passed before what he had rightly said about the historical character of the Fourth Gospel made an impression on a wider circle. If the exact year is to be given, the year 1867, in which the first volume of Keim's "History of Jesus" appeared, may be indicated as the turning-point. For the splendid defence

of Baur's fundamental view by Keim plainly contributed much to enable any competent person to enter on the correct completion of Baur's positions. Until about that year the opposition to the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel remained in the circle of the school of Baur, and was limited to the theologians whose position was nearly related to his. Of Baur's own disciples Schwegler, Köstlin, and Zeller, advocated the views of their master; in part indeed before the public appearance of the master himself.* Of the theologians who stand near to Baur, Hilgenfeld and Volkmar, and the Dutch Scholten must be specially cited.†

About this time (say 1844-67), outside the circle of Baur's school the view almost generally prevailing, although in various grades and shades, was that the Fourth Gospel was genuine. Some theories of analysis which had seen the light shortly before the rise of Baur (1838-41) had found no support and were soon tolerably well forgotten, namely, those by Weisse, Schenkel, and Schweizer. These all conclude that the speeches are genuine, but that the narrative portions are in greater or lesser degree later additions.‡ All the authors of commentaries to the Gospel of St. John belong to the decided defenders of its genuineness, namely, Meyer (in his "Commentary on the New Testament"), Luthardt (1852-3), Hengstenberg (1861-3), Ebrard (1862), Brückner (1863), and others. We find among these not only some who were determined under all circumstances to defend the tradition in the style of an advocate, but some also who (like Meyer) were ready and well qualified for a sober examination of scientific bases. But there were further, on the side of the defenders, learned men of exceptional scientific reputation and of recognised impartiality in historical judgment. We need only name Bleek, Ewald, Hase and Reuss.§ Certainly, while they

* Schwegler, "Montanism," 1841; "The post-Apostolic Age," 2 vols., 1846. Karl Reinhold Köstlin, "The Doctrinal Conception of the Gospel and Epistles of John," 1843. Edward Zeller, "The External Testimony respecting the Existence and Origin of the Fourth Gospel" (*Theol. Jahrbücher*), 1845.

† Hilgenfeld, "The Gospel and Epistles of John, presented according to their Doctrinal Conception," 1849; "The Gospels in their Rise and Historical Significance," 1854. Volkmar, "The Religion of Jesus, and its Earliest Development," 1857; "The Origin of our Gospels," 1856. Scholten, "The Gospel according to John," 1864 (German translation, 1867).

‡ Ch. Hermann Weisse, "The Gospel History Critically and Philosophically Considered," Two vols. 1838. "The Present Stage of the Gospels Question," 1856. Schenkel, "Review of the Most Recent Editions of the Life of Jesus" in "Studien und Kritiken," 1840. Alexander Schweizer, "The Gospel of John critically investigated," 1841.

§ Bleek, "Contributions to the Criticism of the Gospels," 1846; "Introduction to the New Testament," published posthumously, 1862. Ewald, *Jahrbücher of Biblical Science*, III., 1851; V., 1853; "The Johannine Writings," I., 1861. Hase "The Tübingen School—a letter to Baur," 1855; "The Life of Jesus—a manual" (in various editions, 5th edition, 1865).

defend
did not
full an
conten
even a
conces
Even i
that t
not be
given,
tent of
were c
in the
charac
able "
Histor
the po
a dou
was b
these
freedo
tradit
here l
that e
doubl
the n
aband
invest
Apost
that a
from
respec
Jesus
save t
analys
portion
the ex
holds,
the la
uted t
other
course
The
theref
presen
Schwe
histor
This
critici
were
school
tion t
the A
Gospo
circle
ologia
ceptic
twent

defended the Johannine composition, they did not all, by any means, vouch for the full and unconditional historicity of the contents. And so there were not wanting, even at this time, more or less far-reaching concessions to the critical point of view. Even Luthardt and Brückner acknowledged that the subjective views of the author had not been without influence on the account given, that is so far as the form and content of the communicated speeches of Christ were concerned. Weizsäcker went furthest in the acknowledgment of the subjective character of the Gospel account in his valuable "Investigations respecting the Gospel History," 1864. He sought to show that the portrait of Christ, as here drawn, bears a double character throughout. True, it was based on historical reminiscences. But these were treated everywhere with great freedom. The historical and the ideal tradition and theological reflection were here blended into an indissoluble unity, so that every link of the account allowed of a double interpretation. The historicity of the narrative was, to all intent however, abandoned, and Weizsäcker concluded his investigations with the admission that the Apostle himself was not the author, but that a disciple had composed the Gospel from the traditions of his master. In many respects the view of Renan in his "Life of Jesus" is in touch with that of Weizsäcker, save that Renan prefers a more external analysis. He also finds the unhistorical portions in the speeches of Christ, whilst the external framework of the events is, he holds, essentially historical. Jottings of the latter, he thought might still be attributed to the Apostle. The speeches, on the other hand, "those metaphysical discourses," were insertions by a later hand. The "theory of analysis" appears here, therefore, just in the reverse form to the presentation of it by Weisse, Schenkel and Schweizer. It is not the speeches, but the historical narrative which is Johannine.

This was something like the position of criticism in the two to three decades which were dominated in Germany by Baur's school on the one hand, and by the opposition to it on the other. The combating of the Apostolic authenticity of the Fourth Gospel did not reach essentially beyond the circle of Baur's school. Unprejudiced theologians also possessing a free historical perception still held firmly to it. *In the last twenty-five years a complete change has,*

however, taken place. "The denial of the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel is that result of the Tübingen school which has secured most assent far beyond the circle of its special adherents." So says Bernhard Weiss with full justification in his "Introduction to the New Testament" (p. 616), and he is a decided defender of the genuineness. But not only has the number of opponents increased, the contending parties have also come a good deal nearer to one another. Those who dispute the genuineness have given up a number of Baur's untenable assertions. It is recognised that the Gospel is at least some thirty to forty years older than Baur admitted; that it arose not 160-170 A.D., but at latest about 130 A.D.; that it was not simply a poetical product, but that to a greater or less extent it used other traditions which were existing parallel to the Synoptics; and that finally even the difference between the Johannine and Synoptic picture of Christ, whilst great, is not so marked as Baur had drawn it. On the other side it is recognised, in a growing degree, even by the most decided of the defenders of the genuineness, that the historical material has here undergone some remodelling through the subjectivity of the Evangelist; that the history is not for the Evangelist an end in itself, but the means of presenting his ideas. The points of view which Weizsäcker once indicated have already pressed far towards the position of complete acceptance. *Thus the present condition of the question shows a gradual and mutual approach of opponents.*

As already remarked, the great work of Keim, "The History of Jesus of Nazareth" (three vols., 1867-72), contributed essentially to this result. In the first volume, when speaking of "Sources," he also presented a thorough investigation of the character and origin of the Fourth Gospel. His view of the question is very like Baur's. The position of the latter, however, freed here from its excrescences and manifest defects, made a greater impression in its new form than in its first advocacy by Baur himself. Keim acknowledges that the external evidence compels us to place the Gospel considerably earlier than Baur did, for Justin Martyr (cir. 140-150 A.D.) knew it in his time. The references to Montanism and to the discussions about the Lord's Supper, which Baur asserts are in the Gospel, Keim surrenders. In forming an estimate of the plan and theological character of the Gospel, several of Baur's venture-some assumptions are withdrawn. Keim, for example, over against Baur's one-sided

Rense, "The History of the Holy Scriptures of the New Testament" (in various editions, 4th edition, 1864, 5th edition, 1874).

emphasis of the Greek character of the Evangelist's theology, does greater justice to points of contact with Old Testament Jewish thought. He therefore declares that it is probable the Evangelist was of Gentile and not of Jewish descent. He also acknowledges that remnants of historical tradition are contained in the Gospel, notwithstanding the fact that he lays stress on its unhistorical character.

Among the large number of critics who during recent decades have declared *against the Apostolic origin* of the Fourth Gospel are to be found theologians of very different schools; not simply such as have been more or less influenced by Baur, but those also who have arisen from the ranks of his opponents. This is surely a symptom which indicates that the antithesis no longer dominates New Testament criticism generally. Of the theologians influenced by Baur we may cite (though with some reservation) Hausrath, H. J. Holtzmann, Thoma, Pfeiderer, Oscar Holtzmann.* Among these, H. J. Holtzmann especially, has furnished valuable contributions to the solution of the Johannine problem, and in a similar way to Keim, he has modified the positions held by Baur. The others move essentially on the same line. Thoma, however, has, by his wild fancies, by means of which he sees nothing but allegory in the Gospel from beginning to end, even down to the most trifling particulars, furnished proof that science at times deviates from the straight course. Among theologians of another school, Hase and Weizsäcker are the chief. They have so changed their earlier positions that they are now distinctly to be reckoned among the opponents of the genuineness of the Gospel.† Nearly related to these, in their general conception, are Mangold and Immer.‡ The former must be described as an extremely prudent and conservatively inclined theologian, and his secession to the camp of the opponents is a significant symptom in the history of our question. But a number of other theologians also, without publishing thorough investigations, have admitted in incidental

notes, that they were no longer able to hold to the presupposition of Apostolic origin.

As an indication that doubts respecting the historicity of our Gospel have laid hold of a wide circle, one may cite the revival of the "theory of analysis," by Wendt. He not only cuts out pieces not considered genuine, but holds the genuine parts to be historical only in a qualified sense.*

Of still more significance, perhaps, than the growing number of the opponents, is the circumstance that the *defenders* also make stronger and stronger admissions as to the unhistorical character of the Gospel. There are still some, certainly, who maintain the full historicity, e.g., Godet (various editions), Keil (1881), Schanz (1885), and Wähle (1888), in their commentaries. But beside these stand theologians of conservative bent who, whilst distinctly defending the Apostolic origin, find themselves compelled to admit that the Evangelist does not draw the portrait of Jesus as He actually was, but as He appeared to the Apostle's ripened faith and knowledge. Luthardt and Grau have expressed themselves on this point in very strong words.† The two most respected defenders of the genuineness in recent decades, Berschlag and Weiss, go still further in acknowledgment of the subjective remodelling of the history by the Evangelist.‡ Their view comes very near to that of Weizsäcker, so that the question arises how it is possible with such a general conception to maintain the Apostolic origin.

The situation here set forth is only so far as Germany is concerned. In other countries, for example in England, the defenders are in a large majority. Among opponents, who have busied themselves very thoroughly with the problem, one may name, say, Tayler, the anonymous author of "Supernatural Religion," and Samuel Davidson;§ and we may cite among defenders, Westcott, Sanday, Reynolds, Hutton, Gloag, and the late American theologian, Ezra Abbot.||

* Wendt, "The Doctrine of Jesus," two vols. 1886-90.

† Luthardt, "The Johannine Origin of the Fourth Gospel," 1874. Grau, "History of the Development of New Testament Literature," 2nd vol., 1871.

‡ Berschlag, "The Johannine Question," 1876; "Life of Jesus," two vols., 1885-6. Bernhard Weiss, in his edition of "Meyer's Commentary," 1880; "Life of Jesus," two vols., 1882; "Manual of Introduction to New Testament," 1884.

§ J. J. Tayler, "An Attempt to Ascertain the Character of the Fourth Gospel," 1867; "Supernatural Religion," 2nd vol. (various editions). S. Davidson, "An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament," two vols., 1868; second edition, 1882.

|| Westcott, "Introduction to the Study of the Four Gospels" (various editions), and in "Speaker's Commentary," 1880. Sanday, "The Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel: the Gospels in the 2nd Century," 1876. Reynolds, in the "Pulpit Commentary," 1888. Hutton, "Essays, Theological and Literary," 1st vol. (Essay VII., "The Historical Problems of the Fourth Gospel"). Gloag, "Introduction to the Johannine Writings," 1891. Ezra Abbot, "The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel, and other Critical Essays," Boston, 1888.

* Hausrath, "History of New Testament Times," second edition. Vol. IV., 1877. Heinrich Julius Holtzmann, "Manual of Introduction to the New Testament," second edition, 1886; in the "Hand-Commentary to the New Testament," Vol. IV., 1891; and numerous papers in "Hilgenfeld's Magazine for Scientific Theology," and other Magazines. Thoma, "The Origin of John's Gospel," 1882. Otto Pfeiderer, "Primitive Christianity: its Scriptures and Doctrines," 1887. Oscar Holtzmann, "John's Gospel Investigated and Explained," 1887.

† Hase, "History of Jesus," 1876. Weizsäcker, "The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church," 1886.

‡ Mangold in his edition of Bleek's "Introduction to the New Testament." Third Edition, 1875; fourth edition, 1886. Immer, "New Testament Theology," 1877.

The situ
in Germ
chief str
proof of
ternal ev
test has
realm of
internal

While
grounds
brought
defende
deavour
far as
We can
like thi
itself at
which d

In Ge
est spac
internat
is decisi
would s
the weig
against

The g
general

(A)

(B)

(A) V

pel with

its histo

question

edged t

in grea

narrativ

Christ.

that the

sources

one of

the com

special

be attr

written

Fourth

almost

ratives

small p

first E

The m

to his

higher

Synopt

with a

speech

* On th

natural R

evidence

ly sought

The situation in England differs from that in Germany, in that both *pro* and *con* the chief stress is still laid in England on the proof of the Johannine authorship from external evidence, whilst in Germany the contest has moved more and more from the realm of external evidence to that of the internal.*

While we seek further to set forth the grounds for their conclusions, which are brought to the front alike by opponents and defenders of the genuineness, we shall endeavour to allow the contending parties, as far as possible, to speak for themselves. We cannot avoid, however, in a narrative like this, our own interpretation showing itself at points, for it is apparent at once in which direction the tongue inclines.

In German literature, at least, the greatest space is occupied by the discussion of *internal evidence*. And rightly so, for that is decisive. Even the best external evidence would scarcely be in a position to set aside the weight of internal evidence if this were against the Johannine authorship.

The grounds of internal evidence may in general be brought under two heads:

(A) The Gospel of John and the Synoptics.

(B) The Gospel of John and the Apostle John.

(A) What does a comparison of our Gospel with the Synoptics teach us respecting its historical character? That is the chief question to be put to-day. It is acknowledged that the three first Gospels contain in great part the same material, the same narratives, and the same sayings of Jesus Christ. It must, therefore, be admitted that they go back on one or more common sources. That which is distinctive of any one of the three Evangelists, in addition to the common elements, arises either from his special way of utilising the sources, or is to be attributed to the possession of other written or oral information. But in the Fourth Gospel the matter of the book is almost altogether different—different narratives and different speeches. Only a small portion of the narrative of the three first Evangelists is to be found in John. The most of what John narrates is peculiar to his Gospel, and this is true in a still higher degree of the speeches. Only one Synoptic saying here and there do we meet with again in the Fourth Gospel; the speeches here have different contents almost

throughout. This phenomenon, which strikes one at once in the most casual reading, allows of a double interpretation, which it has, in fact, received. Some say if this material, that is these speeches, were historical, stronger traces of them would be discoverable in the Synoptics. Others say just the reverse—the fact that the fourth Evangelist furnishes new material is proof that he possessed independent historical information. So long as the material is regarded only *quantitatively*, the latter are decidedly right. If the quality of the material be not taken into consideration, then a mere balance in quantity raises a prepossession in its favour. As a matter of fact, phenomena appear here which the defence quite rightly turns to its own account. In the Fourth Gospel we come across several details, which neither produce the impression that they are legendary, nor that they have been invented in the interest of any theological idea, and which, therefore, can only be understood as constituent parts of a real historical tradition. Such are—*e.g.*, Bethsaida as the place of abode of Andrew and Peter (i. 44); Bethany, on the other side of Jordan, and Enon, near to Salim, as the place where John baptised (i. 28, iii. 23); the statement that John was not yet cast into prison when Jesus entered on His ministry (thoroughly probable in itself); that Jesus withdrew Himself to Ephraim before the last Passover; that He was examined by Annas, and other things of this kind. These are all historical memoranda, whose historicity there is not the slightest ground for doubting. They speak decidedly for the Evangelist having at his command another tradition independent of the Synoptics.

But along with this independence in material it strikes us all the more that the Evangelist, in those portions which are common with the Synoptics, is *verbally dependent on them*. The number of such portions is not great. But in every one of them strong formal points of connection with the Synoptics are to be discerned—*e.g.*, in the sections *re* John the Baptist (i. 19-34); the purification of the Temple (ii. 13-16); the nobleman of Capernaum (iv. 47-54); the feeding of the five thousand (vi. 1-21); the anointing in Bethany (xii. 1-8); and generally in the history of the Passion. If these Johannine portions are compared with the parallel sections of the Synoptics, several somewhat strong deviations in matter of fact will be found in conjunction with a harmony in many verbal details all the more surprising. That

* On the negative side, for example, the author of "Supernatural Religion" has laid great stress on the lack of external evidence; and on the affirmative side Ezra Abbot has specially sought to present the proof from that source.

there is here a literary dependence of the one on the other there can be no doubt, and the fact is almost generally recognised. Similarly, it is almost generally admitted that the fourth Evangelist is the later. But some believe that even an Apostle, who in later times added something new to the already existing Gospels, might very easily be so influenced verbally. Others again think it evident that we have here the composition of a later author, who derived his knowledge of the Gospel history essentially from the Synoptics, but remodelled it in very free fashion. Strict proof of this cannot indeed be furnished. But, it may be said, that literary dependence on the Synoptics is very strange for an Apostle.

As distinguished from these external differences and points of contact, the far-reaching qualitative difference in material, *the actual deviations in the account*, are of far greater weight, and this just as much in the course of the history as in the speeches of Christ.

(1) *As to the Course of the History.*—And, first of all, important differences may be established, in which the internal evidence is perhaps in favour of the Johannine quite as much as, if not more than, the Synoptic account—we mean the differences as to the *journeys to the feasts*, and the *day of Jesus' death*.

According to the Fourth Gospel, Jesus during His public ministry is frequently back and forward between Galilee and Judæa, in that He travels from Galilee where He dwells to Jerusalem to the great feasts, and each time returns thence, after a longer ministry, to the North. The statements of the Gospel in reference to this are very full. Three times Jesus goes to Jerusalem: first to the Passover (ii. 13), then to a feast not named (v. 1), and, finally, about the time of the Feast of Tabernacles in autumn (vii. 14). Then in the interval, also, a Passover is cited to which Jesus did not go up (vi. 4); so between the first and third journey there is a year and a half. Jesus did not return to Galilee again after the last journey, but went about in Judæa and on the other side of Jordan, until the Passover when He was crucified. The public ministry of Jesus thus occupies a little more than two years. The Synoptics say nothing of all these events. They only tell of His ministry in Galilee, and make Him travel to Jerusalem for the first time to that Passover in connection with which His earthly ministry ended. Of a longer and more frequent ministry in Judæa they tell us nothing, and they give just as little indication

of the length of Jesus' public ministry. Now Baur, in particular, endeavours to explain the frequent visits to Jerusalem from the plan of the Evangelist—the latter postulates them because he wishes Jesus' appearance to be in the centre of the Jewish world. As a matter of fact, it is not to be denied that the Evangelist lays great stress on Jesus' appearance on the stage of action in Jerusalem (*cf.* especially vii. 3). But all the details are not explained in this way. And on the other side, it has rightly been shown, that even in the Synoptic narrative there are single facts which presuppose a longer activity in Jerusalem. It is on the whole improbable in itself too, that Jesus, who still observed the law (Matt. xvii. 24), should for any length of time have failed to go up to Jerusalem to a feast. The position of the apologists for the Gospel is therefore, to say the least, not an indefensible one.

A similar judgment might perhaps be given in reference to the *day of Jesus' death*. It is very remarkable that our Gospels are not agreed as to whether Jesus was crucified on the 14th or 15th of Nisan—*i.e.*, whether the meal of which He partook with His disciples on the evening before His death was the Jewish Passover, or whether the Passover occurred on the evening of the day of crucifixion. To many exegetes and critics it appears impossible generally that a difference on this point could exist between the Evangelists, and on this account they seek by ingenious explanation to put the difference aside. But facts are stubborn, and do not yield to our wishes. No unprejudiced person can disregard the fact that Jesus' meal with His disciples on the evening before the crucifixion was, according to the Synoptics, the Jewish Passover (Matt. xxvi. 17 ff., Mark xiv. 12 ff., Luke xxii. 7 ff.); that, *vice versa*, according to John, the Jewish Passover did not occur until the evening of the day of crucifixion (John xiii. 1, xiii. 29, xviii. 28, xix. 14). All the learning which has been applied to reversing the apparent sense of these passages is vain. No doubt can remain respecting them in the unprejudiced mind. But which is the true tradition, the Synoptic or the Johannine? That is a question which cannot well be decided with certainty, for as much is to be said for the one account as for the other. The opponents of the authenticity of the Johannine story point to the fact that all that is said by the Synoptics respecting the Last Supper, the preparation for it, and the whole event itself is inextricably interwoven with

the as
over.
state
be as
Can t
of the
of the
at the
opinio
emm
hand,
the fo
He is
observ
hibit
died a
v. 7).
him,
Lamb
nents
fende
accou
three
tle.
fact
count
been
began
meal
and t
It is,
prob
tion
throu
day.
any
day.
In
matt
be un
it be
The
cates
is sti
at th
son m
the f

* Ac
bathe
crim
nounc
iv. 1).
too, b
is for
"Light
brought
depos
ed. M
ἐγκαλ
ταύρ.)
cree t
the S
αὐτοῦ
xvi. 6
γὰρ,
hold
(1879)

the assumption that it was the Jewish Passover. It is of no use disputing a *single* statement; the kernel of the narrative must be assailed if the account is to be denied. Can there have been formed in the bosom of the earliest Christianity, up to the time of the composition of the writing which is at the basis of our Synoptic Gospels, an opinion so unhistorical respecting this solemn and important event? On the other hand, the remodelling of the tradition by the fourth Evangelist is easily understood. He is not wishful to represent Jesus as an observer of a Jewish ceremony, but to exhibit Paul's thought that Jesus Himself had died as the true Passover offering (1 Cor. v. 7). So Jesus is crucified, according to him, on the day on which the Passover Lamb was to be slain. So say the opponents of the Johannine account. The defenders of John's Gospel say the Synoptic account is not decisive, for none of our three first Gospels was written by an Apostle. They lay great stress in turn on the fact that, according to the Synoptic account, the day of crucifixion would have been a great feast-day. For the feast itself began with the celebration of the Passover meal on the evening of the 14th of Nisan, and the following day was like a Sabbath. It is, they say, in the highest degree improbable that the condemnation and execution of Jesus would have been pressed through by legally minded Jews on such a day. For the Jewish law expressly forbids any trial in Court on a Sabbath or feast-day.*

In general, too, the haste with which the matter is dealt with by the Jews is only to be understood if there was a desire to finish it before the commencement of the feast. The release of Barabbas by Pilate also indicates that the commencement of the feast is still ensuing, for the release of a prisoner at this time means, evidently, that the person referred to may still be able to celebrate the feast with his friends. These instances

are, in fact, in the highest degree important. And however difficult it may be to hold that the kernel of the Synoptic account is unhistorical, yet it must be distinctly granted that the Johannine narrative is internally the more probable. One can only say that the evidence *pro* and *con* is here evenly balanced.

The judgment is much more unfavourable to the Gospel of John, however, if we fix our eyes on the *general construction of the Gospel history*—i.e., on the *progressive way in which Jesus appears as Messiah*. In the treatment of the Johannine question this point has frequently failed to receive due attention, but it is one of the most important and decisive of all. That its significance has not been generally acknowledged is to be explained partly by the peculiarity of our Synoptic Gospels. Our Matthew and Luke, for example, have obliterated on this point the account of the oldest source. On the other hand, in Mark, which, without question, has retained most faithfully the account of the oldest source, it is perfectly clear that *Jesus only avowed Himself as Messiah late in His ministry, and by degrees*. Three points may here be noticed:—

(a) *Jesus Himself* is, from the beginning of His public appearance, inwardly certain of His divine calling. He even demands that He be approached trustfully, that His preaching be believingly accepted, and that in Him help be sought, trusting that God offers grace and succour through Him to men. But only in this sense does He demand faith. He did not advance the claim to be Messiah for a long time. If He was inwardly certain of His Messiahship, then with a true teacher's wisdom, He shunned for long to declare it, because He knew well that the people had a different conception of Messiah's office from His. They thought of it more in a political than a religious sense.

(b) To this attitude of Jesus corresponds that of *the disciples*. They are seized by the power of His preaching, and attach themselves to Him as scholars to a teacher without having any presentiment about His Messiahship. How far they were from any knowledge of this kind is shown most forcibly by the exclamation at the stilling of the storm (*cf.* Mark iv. 41): "What manner of man is this (verbally, 'Who then is this?') that even the wind and the sea obey Him?" Such a question of astonishment would have been impossible if they had already recognised in Him the Messiah, or if they had even had a weak faith in His Messiahship. In full accord with this we

* According to the Mishna no court was to be held on Sabbath or feast-days (Beza v. 2), and not on the day before in criminal cases; because in such cases the judgment was pronounced on the day after the hearing of the case (Sanhedrin, iv. 1). This command not to hold court is narrowly observed, too, by the Jews of the dispersion. A chief point of what is forbidden on the Sabbath, Philo cites by way of example:—"Lighting a fire, labouring in the field, carrying a burden, bringing a charge or giving a decision in court, or calling in deposits or loans" (De migratione Abrahami, §16, Opera ed. Mangey L., 450: πυρὸς αἰνέειν ἢ γεωργεῖν ἢ ἀνθοδρομῶν ἢ ἐγκαλεῖν ἢ δικάζειν ἢ παρακαταθέσθαι ἀπαρεῖν ἢ δάνεια ἀναπαράσσειν). The Jews of Asia Minor obtained from Augustus a decree that they should not be compelled to appear in court on the Sabbath (Joseph. Ants. xvi. 6. 2: ἑγγύνης τε μὴ διολογείν αὐτοῖς ἐν σαββάσιν ἢ τῇ πρὸ ταύτης παρασκευῇ ἀπὸ ὥρας ἑνάτης, xvi. 6. 4: ἵνα σαββάσι μὴ εἰς ἀνάγκην ἰουδαίων ἐγγυίας ὁμολογείν). For Rabbinical passages respecting the command not to hold court on the Sabbath, *cf.* Ritter, "Philo and the Halacha" (1879), p. 130.

have the confession of Peter at Cæsarea Philippi (Mark viii. 29). The solemn fashion in which this confession is cited as an important and decisive act shows clearly that we have here the first declaration of it. In Matt. xvi. 17 the following sentence occurs, too, in the answer of Jesus: "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father which is in heaven." The knowledge won is here expressly advanced as new. It is very probable that this sentence is from the oldest source. If, however, this were not the case it rightly represents the situation. For the first time the disciples have now recognised Jesus as Messiah. But even now He does not appear publicly as such. He expressly forbids the disciples to speak of it, because His coming forward with the title of Messiah is still forbidden in the interests of the people, who need training to the idea. Not until quite the end of His ministry does He allow the multitude to do homage to Him as Messiah. At the trial before the Sanhedrim He finally confessed Himself Messiah, even in presence of His enemies.

(c) In accordance with all this there is finally the attitude of John the Baptist, as recorded in the oldest source. According to Matt. iii. 14, 15, John indeed recognised Jesus, even at the Baptism, as the "mightier" One, and therefore refused to baptise Him. But the oldest source knew nothing of this. Neither Mark nor Luke relate this episode. It is certainly a later addition of the first Evangelist. According to the account in Mark i. 9-11, with which Luke iii. 21, 22 essentially agrees, John the Baptist received no revelation at the Baptism respecting Jesus. It was Jesus who saw the Heaven open and the Spirit descending upon Himself, and the voice from Heaven, "Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased," was only directed to Jesus. The meaning of the incident was that Jesus was equipped by the Spirit, and thoroughly assured of His Sonship to God. That John had any knowledge of this is not said. It was not until he was in prison, and heard of the mighty works of Jesus, that there came to him a presentiment that this perhaps might be the Messiah. Then he sent his disciples to Jesus to ask, "Art thou He that should come?" (Matt. xi. 2 ff., Luke vii. 18 ff.). The most of the commentators understand this expression as though John had become doubtful again. This conception is, however, probable neither according to the verbal statement nor according to the context of the Synoptic narrative. The question of

John is not the question of one who has grown doubtful, but of one in whom the spark of faith is beginning to glimmer for the first time. All this furnishes a thoroughly harmonious picture. *In the earliest time of Jesus' public ministry there is nothing said of His Messiahship. Only step by step is this advanced; and only step by step does the knowledge of it dawn on those closely associated with Him.* This is the account of the oldest source, and it has throughout internal probability in its favour.

How is it now with this point in the Fourth Gospel? The account there is in every respect the exact opposite.

(a) Jesus appears from the very first with a full claim to Divine Sonship and Messiahship. One of His first deeds is the driving out of the traders and money-changers from the Temple (ii. 14-17). This powerful interference with the police regulations of the Temple presupposes the absolute consciousness of His own higher authority. And not merely the consciousness of this, but also the intention to publicly appear with a vindication of it. Whilst Jesus interferes in such an autocratic fashion with earthly ordinances, He appears publicly as one who has higher power than the high priests and scribes. It is quite in harmony with the representation of Jesus given by the Synoptics that they do not narrate this event until quite the end of the Gospel history (Matt. xxi. 12 ff., Mark xi. 15 ff., Luke xix. 45 ff.). In John it stands at the outset of the history. Can any one doubt which is the historical passage? And if the account of the Fourth Gospel is unhistorical in only one important point, is it possible to accept a disciple of Jesus who had lived through it all as the author? This would indeed be very difficult if the defect were an isolated instance. But it is by no means so. The whole of the remaining account in the Fourth Gospel is in harmony with this fundamental difference. Whilst, according to the oldest Synoptic source, Jesus did not come forward as Messiah until late in His ministry, and only by degrees, He appears in John from beginning to end with the same claim to an unique divine authority. That He should be acknowledged as the Son of God, who was with the Father before the foundation of the world, and who now is sent from the Father to bring the full revelation—this is the fundamental claim which Jesus puts forward from the beginning, and always in the same way. And this fundamental claim also is from the first responded to by some believing souls.

(b) T
to Jesus
but the
ognised
found
brother
him of
prophe
(i. 45).
the kno
from t
for thei

(c) E
Jesus t
ciples
does fo
point
after h
in Jesu
deed h
events
to the
dents
intend
the Fo
the Ba
spectin
God.
sent m
said u
the S
Him,
the H
ord th
So Joh
sured
He is
vealed
bear w

The
the F
sistent
that t
sive.
closur
case,
office.
second
not h
discip
most
ers of
dertal
ture h
serted
fulfill
even
perha
of the
media
the B

(b) *The first disciples* attach themselves to Jesus, not simply as scholars to a teacher, but they follow Him *because they have recognised in Him the Messiah*. "We have found the Messiah," says Andrew to his brother Simon (i. 41). "We have found him of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write," Philip tells Nathanael (i. 45). The disciples have here therefore the knowledge of the Messiahship of Jesus from the first; indeed, this is the reason for their being His disciples.

(c) But *John the Baptist* recognised in Jesus the promised Messiah before the disciples did so. He does not simply, as he does for the most part in the Synoptics, point to one "mightier" who will come after him; he recognises this mightier one in Jesus immediately Jesus appears, and indeed he is instructed respecting this by the events at the Baptism. Whilst, according to the oldest Synoptic source, these incidents are known to Jesus only, and are only intended for Him, they are, according to the Fourth Gospel, essentially intended for the Baptist, and are to testify to him respecting Jesus' Messiahship and Sonship to God. "I knew Him not; but He that sent me to baptise with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on Him, the same is He which baptiseth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw and bare record that this is the Son of God" (i. 33, 34). So John is from the first a strong and assured witness for the Messiahship of Jesus. He is the first to whom this has been revealed, and it is consequently his calling to bear witness of it henceforth to the world.

The Synoptic account and the account of the Fourth Gospel are each thoroughly consistent in all these points. *But it is clear that these two pictures are mutually exclusive*. In one case, you have a gradual disclosure of Jesus as the Messiah, in the other case, an immediate recognition of this office. If the first picture is historical the second cannot be, and he who draws it cannot have been an Apostle—an immediate disciple of the Lord. This dilemma is almost universally recognised. The defenders of the genuineness must therefore undertake the task of proving the second picture historical. It cannot, however, be asserted that this task has been satisfactorily fulfilled. Appeal is made to the fact that even Matthew and Luke, and especially perhaps Matthew, presuppose a recognition of the Messiahship by the disciples and immediate followers—particularly by John the Baptist—at the very first appearance of

Jesus. So far as concerns Matthew that is essentially correct. But on purely literary grounds, it is probable that Matthew has not preserved for us, in this point, the account of the oldest sources, that this rather is before us in Mark. Here, therefore, are difficulties for the defenders, which have not yet been satisfactorily explained, and are by no means easy of explanation.*

(2) The case is similar in reference to the second chief point, in which our Gospel deviates from the Synoptics—in reference to *the contents of the speeches of Jesus*. The difference is just as penetrative here as in reference to the course of the history. The themes treated in the two are quite different. In the Synoptics, the preaching of Jesus groups itself round the kingdom of God as the fundamental conception. Jesus appears with the tidings that the dawn of this kingdom is at hand, and He points to the change of mind which is necessary on the part of any who would participate therein. Almost all the sayings and parables, therefore, either speak of the nature of the kingdom of God, or they explain the moral claims on its members. The kingdom of God is the *summum bonum*. The "goods" of the kingdom are not external, political or material, however, but inward, religious and moral—the fatherly love and grace of God, which forgives the sin of all those who draw near to Him as children, and bestows on these in overflowing goodness all they need. Men are straightway brought into the enjoyment of these "goods" through the activity of Jesus. The realisation of the kingdom of God has, therefore, begun already. It is developed from the smallest beginnings by degrees and without observation. It becomes growingly strong and more widely extended, until finally, at the end of this age, it is established in its full glory. This emphasis on the inward character of the kingdom of God and its gradual development expressly sets aside and combats the usual Jewish conception; and the same may be said of the conditions of entrance to the kingdom. The righteousness of the disciples of Jesus must exceed that of the Scribes and Pharisees. Their life must not simply be outwardly correct, but must spring from a right disposition—from perfect love, love to God, and love to neighbours. Only he who renounces every private interest, every per-

* It is self-evident that if our reproduction of the Synoptic picture is historical the stories of the childhood of Jesus, in Matthew and Luke (Matt. chaps. i. and ii., and Luke chaps. i. and ii.), cannot be historical as well. But against these there is so strong a misgiving, arising in other ways, that their historicity is surrendered by several conservative critics.

sonal advantage, and pursues no other end in life than the service of his neighbour, is a child of the heavenly Father, and can have part in the kingdom of God. Since it is through Jesus, however, that introduction to the kingdom is possible, and through Him that the kingdom itself is made real, the attitude men assume to Him is by no means without influence on their destiny. Jesus is the confidant of the heavenly Father through whom the Father fulfils His loving will. "All things are delivered unto me of my Father; and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him" (Matt. xi. 27, Luke x. 22). Through Him the coming to God and the consequent attainment of salvation are mediated. Therefore, trustful attachment to Him is of decisive significance for the destiny of men. "Whosoever shall receive me, receiveth not me, but Him that sent me" (Mark ix. 37, Matt. x. 40, Luke ix. 48; cf. also Luke x. 16). "Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven." (Matt. x. 32, 33, Luke xii. 8, 9; cf. also Mark viii. 38, Luke ix. 26). "Blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in me" (Matt. xi. 6, Luke vii. 23).

The latter set of sayings form the zenith of Jesus' judgment of Himself in the Synoptics. Their number is small almost to vanishing point in comparison with the mass of other contents of the preaching of Jesus. They are completely overlaid, therefore, by the impression which the Synoptic Gospels give. In the Gospel of John it is quite the reverse. Here these thoughts form the subject of almost all the speeches. Almost all that Jesus says here consists of variations on the theme that He alone knows the heavenly Father, and can reveal Him to the world; and that therefore acceptance or rejection of His word is decisive for the destiny of men. Whosoever accepts Him has light and life; whosoever accepts Him not is judged already. There is scarcely anything in the Fourth Gospel of all the rich content of the Synoptic preaching of Jesus, of all that is said respecting the nature and development of the kingdom of God; and respecting the better righteousness which is the condition of participation in the kingdom. The difference indicated is not simply quantitative, but those self-revelations by Jesus respecting the significance of His person, the groundwork of

which is to be found indeed in the Synoptics, have increased, and have received a quite different theological setting. The nature of salvation here consists essentially in the perfect revelation, in the perfect knowledge of God. Through light comes life. "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (viii. 32). Jesus however, and Jesus alone, brings this revelation. Therefore the acceptance of His word is from the first the cardinal question here in a quite different way from its being such in the Synoptics. In the Synoptics the essential demands are love of God and love of your neighbour, whereas in John there is in the foreground the formal demand of acceptance of the person of Jesus. Besides, the oneness of Jesus with His heavenly Father is placed here on an entirely different basis from that in the Synoptics. In the latter it is thought of in a purely ethical sense; Jesus is initiated into the thoughts of the Father, and the Father into those of the Son. In the Fourth Gospel this is still a chief point. But the ethical union rests here on the metaphysical. Jesus' existence did not date its beginning from His human birth, but even before the foundation of the world He was with God as a second divine potency, that is as the Logos (Word) of God, which is itself God.* The historical person Jesus is no more than the phenomenal appearance of the divine Logos in the flesh. He has, therefore, been with His Father long before His birth. He has come from above, descended from heaven. Therefore is He in the secret of the Father's thoughts; therefore is He, and He alone, in the position to bring the full revelation. The Synoptics know nothing of this metaphysical basis for the ethical union of Jesus with His Father. There is not the smallest trace of this thought in Jesus' declarations respecting Himself according to the Synoptics.

Is this important deviation of the Fourth Gospel from the Synoptics not at the same time a deviation from the true history? This question is a growingly urgent one in all decisions respecting the authenticity of

* The Greek expression "Logos" (John i. 1) is translated in Western versions of the Bible by "Word." It might, just as well be translated "Reason" (Vernunft), for the Greek expression signifies both, and the notion which lies at the basis of the conception of Logos allows of both modes of translation. The starting-point of the Logos idea is not simply the thought that God works by His word—His speaking—(Gen. i.), but that He works through His reason, His wisdom (Prov. viii. and ix.). This active medium of God's life and work is thought of as an independent existence, as a second divine potency by the side of God Himself. God, who is in Himself hidden, works outwardly through the mediation of the Logos. That is the idea which had been developed under strong influence from Greek philosophy in the circles of Hellenistic Jews previous to the time of our Evangelist, and was taken up as a known and current idea, and employed by him for his theological purpose.

the Joh
point, a
ready be
and def
recognis
genuine
Christ a
single p
from the
by the p
gelist no
tent also
is the
party be
thinkab
ple; th
earnest
points a
it to ad

(B)
question
compar
tics. C
raised,
logical
with wh

Amo
ly need
tinian
schneid
was nei
Bretsch
lows, r
92-100
Silam
(ἀπεστα
ogies 1
(2) The
of Jor
(so the
ing to
should
well-ku
other p
side of
23) it i
did no
"water
Evang
might
most p
places
well-ku
(iv. 5)
error i
proven
place
Jacob's
from S

* The
place now

the Johannine Gospel. But, just on this point, a very general understanding has already been attained between the opponents and defenders of the genuineness. It is recognised by all prudent defenders of the genuineness that the Johannine speeches of Christ are not really historical reports, that single points rather have been taken from the preaching of Jesus, and remodelled by the particular subjectivity of the Evangelist not simply as to form, but as to content also. The measure of this remodelling is the only really debatable point. One party believes it is only of such a kind as is thinkable in the case of a personal disciple; the other denies this. The more earnestly and conscientiously the particular points are considered the more difficult is it to adhere to the former conception.

(B) We have now exhausted the chief questions which present themselves in a comparison of our Gospel with the Synoptics. Questions of a weighty kind are also raised, however, *when we compare the theological and literary character of our Gospel with what we know of the Apostle John.*

Among those weighty questions we scarcely need reckon the *alleged ignorance of Palestinian and Jewish affairs*, from which Bretschneider and Baur inferred that the author was neither a Palestinian nor indeed a Jew. Bretschneider, whom Baur practically follows, reckons as errors of this kind (pp. 92-100): (1) That the name of the Pool of Siloam is wrongly translated (ix. 7) "sent" (ἀπεσταλμένος). But similar false etymologies not a few are found in Josephus. (2) The place Bethabara on the other side of Jordan is mistakenly named Bethany (so the Evangelist wrote, at any rate according to the best MSS., ch. i. 28). But why should there not have been, besides the well-known Bethany near Jerusalem, another place similarly named on the other side of Jordan? (3) The place Ænon (iii. 23) it is said is quite unknown and certainly did not exist, for Ænon simply means "water," and was wrongly taken by the Evangelist for the name of a place. One might just as well dispute the existence of most places in the world, for most names of places are originally appellatives. (4) The well-known Shechem, it is said, is called (iv. 5) Sychar in error. But even here an error is improbable, or at least not to be proven. There may easily have been a place Sychar which (on account of the Jacob's well here cited) was situated not far from Shechem.* (5) There is the remark

(vii. 52) that out of Galilee no prophet has arisen (perf. ἐγήγερατ). This is erroneous, it is said; for Jonah and Nahum both sprang from Galilee. But according to the evidence of the best manuscripts, the Evangelist wrote: "Out of Galilee ariseth (pres. ἐγείρεται) no prophet." (6) Again the Evangelist names Caiaphas "the High Priest for this year" (xi. 49, 51, xviii. 13). This involved a wrong notion that the High Priests changed yearly. Here is really a point for consideration. We know quite certainly that the High Priests did not change yearly, and that Caiaphas in particular was in office ten years at least, if not longer. The above expression appears to rest in fact on the idea that the change was annual, and an error of that kind was the more possible, because in heathen worship—for example in Asia Minor—the High Priesthood was a yearly thing. The opponents of the genuineness of the Gospel lay decisive emphasis on this point at present because they have let other points more or less drop. The defenders seek to show that the Evangelist's manner of expression does not necessarily involve the idea of a yearly change. If their attempts are not quite satisfactory, still this point is not of itself decisive.

Here, as before, the minutiae do not determine the question. That result must be sought rather in the *general character of the Gospel*. If we compare this with what we know of the Apostle John, two chief peculiarities strike us: (1) *The opposition of the Gospel to Judaism*, and (2) *the Greek philosophical training of the author*. Both are present in such a degree as could scarcely have been anticipated from the Apostle John.

(1) Respecting the attitude of the Apostle John to the Jewish law, we have the authentic testimony of the Apostle Paul in the Epistle to the Galatians. He tells us, in the 2nd chapter, of that celebrated meeting with the original Apostles in Jerusalem about 50-52 A.D., which we commonly call the Apostolic Council. There Paul propounds the question to the first Apostles as to whether it is legitimate and according to the Divine will to convert the heathen to Jesus Christ without laying upon them the observance of the Jewish law. The result of the deliberations is that the first Apostles acknowledged the legitimacy of Paul's work. But this result is only reached by means of the news Paul has to impart, and his mode of representing the matter. *When they saw that Paul had been intrusted with the Gospel of the uncircumcision, and when*

* The most of modern geographers and exegetes take a place now called *Askar* for the Sychar of the Evangelist.

they perceived the grace which was given to him, they joined hands in fraternal fellowship with him (cf. especially verses 7 and 9). They had, therefore, hitherto presupposed the observance of the law on the part of those who believed in Jesus, as something which went without saying. And they wished still to limit themselves (Gal. ii. 9), in their own activity, to the circle of those who observed the law (to "the circumcision"). They acknowledged Paul's work to be legitimate, but on their side they had no desire to take part in it. Indeed, the predominant view, in the circle of the first Apostles, was, even after the deliberations with Paul, that they as born Jews had to observe the law just as before. When Peter, who was decidedly the freest of those in the circle of the first Apostles, ventured to eat in Antioch with heathen Christians, and so to disregard the Jewish laws respecting meats, he was straightway taken to task for it by the Jerusalem Christians, who were in connection with James. And he did not venture to follow his freer conviction, but withdrew to the ground of observance of the law (Gal. ii. 11, 12). Among the chiefs of the Apostolic circle who played the leading part in these questions, Paul mentions besides James and Peter (Cephas), John also (Gal. ii. 9). Whether the latter was more disposed to fraternise with the stricter James or was like the freer Peter we do not know. But even in the latter case, it must be acknowledged that he still observed the law for himself. Peter even did not dare to emancipate himself from it. This holding fast to Jewish custom presupposes a high estimation of it which does not agree with the fundamental thoughts of the Fourth Gospel. To the Evangelist the Jewish law has become something foreign. He knows it only as the law of the Jews (John vii. 19, viii. 17, x. 34, xv. 25). It has according to him absolutely no significance for one who has received the Divine light and life by Jesus Christ, and so has become a child of God. This matter of fact is so clear that one can hardly understand how it could have been recently denied. This, however, has been done in Franke's book, "The Old Testament in John" (1885)—a work exhibiting great industry and care. The author has tried hard to prove that the Evangelist was fundamentally a Jewish Christian and adherent of the law. We must say that the proof does not hold in face of an unprejudiced examination of the facts. The most of the defenders of the genuineness admit, indeed, that between the position which the

Apostle John took up at the time of the Apostolic Convention and the standpoint of the Gospel there is a difference. It is held, however, to be possible that the Apostle had passed, in his later years, through a development from the one standpoint to the other; that the change of residence to Ephesus, the removal to a freer environment, had made the Apostle himself freer. This is quite possible in itself. But if the immediate circumstances be considered it can hardly be thought probable. The so-called Apostolic Council falls twenty years after the death of Christ. If during this long time the influence of the preaching of Jesus was not enough to make John a liberal in the then Christian thought, was such a transformation probable at a still later time? At the time of the Apostolic Council John was a man of riper years. Could he have completely emancipated himself from the law after this time when he had not done it at an age at which men according to experience are much more susceptible to psychological changes? The more one is convinced of the opposition between the Fourth Gospel and Jewish Christianity observant of the law, the more difficult is it to maintain the Johannine authorship.

(2) The case stands similarly in reference to the other point—the Greek philosophical training of the author. No one can deny that the author of the Fourth Gospel was a man of Greek education. He writes much better Greek than, for example, the Apostle Paul, who yet arose out of Tarsus, a seat of Greek learning and culture, and lived his life, for the most part, amid Greek surroundings. He is specially conversant, too, with that Græco-Jewish philosophy, whose chief representative, the Alexandrian Philo, was an older contemporary of Jesus Christ. This Græco-Jewish philosophy was a peculiar blending of Old Testament views of religion with the philosophy of the Greeks. Its view of the world was rooted in Moses and the prophets as much as in Plato and the Stoics. Both streams are here united in one characteristic whole. In these circles the doctrine of the Divine Logos was worked out—a doctrine which the fourth Evangelist, as already shown above, employs, in order to establish and explain theologically the unique dignity of Jesus Christ. The Logos-doctrine is not the only point of contact, however, between the Fourth Gospel and the Græco-Jewish philosophy. The whole world of the Evangelist's thought is much more Hellenistic than (Old Testament) Jewish. The prominent intellectual characteristic which distin-

guishes
of educa
sists in th
it freed
therefore
So Jesu
brought
holds th
with the
the secon
on Gree
authent
phasis o
all we k
not anti
ing, ind
was a P
the Lak
the learn
are desc
"unleas
13). If
only be i
was the
How co
Gospel,
Greek le
up a diff
They se
possible
our aut
regard,
with the
The Ev
arose sin
has not
of Philo
oughly
Many d
Helleni
with the
the Apo
during
Greek e
lar here
the anti
that the
in his la
of Helle
sary to
difficult
We k
tions w
Gospel
relation
Baur
tion to
questio
that th
author
may be

guishes him comes from the Greek sphere of education. The essence of salvation consists in the knowledge of the truth; through it freedom is attained. Redemption is therefore effected through enlightenment. So Jesus is the Redeemer because He brought the revelation. The Evangelist holds this fundamental view in common with the Gnostics and the Apologists of the second century. It grew up, however, on Greek ground. The opponents of the authenticity of our Gospel lay decisive emphasis on this point. They say that, from all we know of the Apostle John, we could not anticipate such a degree of Greek training, indeed any Greek training at all. He was a Palestinian, son of a fisherman from the Lake of Gennesaret, a man destitute of the learning of the schools. Peter and he are described in the Acts of the Apostles as "unlearned and ignorant men" (Acts iv. 13). If he knew Greek at all, this could only be in a poor degree. His native tongue was the tongue of Palestine—Aramaic. How could such a man have written our Gospel, which presupposes a high degree of Greek learning? The defenders have taken up a difficult position against this argument. They seek to minimise, first of all, as far as possible the extent of the Greek training of our author. Many passages they quite disregard, and they dispute every connection with the Jewish philosophy of Alexandria. The Evangelist's Logos doctrine they say arose simply on Old Testament ground, and has nothing to do with the Logos-doctrine of Philo. These assertions cannot be thoroughly maintained in face of the facts. Many defenders admit a certain measure of Hellenistic learning, and some connection with the doctrine of Philo; but they think the Apostle could have appropriated all this during his later stay in Ephesus amid Greek environment. The question is similar here, therefore, to that in relation to the anti-Jewish standpoint. Is it probable that the Apostle John made such a change in his later years? The greater the amount of Hellenistic culture which we feel it necessary to admit in the Evangelist, the more difficult is it to suppose such a change.

We have now exhausted the chief questions which arise from the character of our Gospel as related to the Synoptics, and in relation to the person of the Apostle John.

Baur's school regarded the Gospel's relation to the *Apocalypse* as important for our question. It was acknowledged as certain that the Gospel could not be by the same author as the Revelation. This, in fact, may be admitted on account of the great

difference between them. But while the school of Schleiermacher deduced from this that the *Apocalypse* could not be by the Apostle, Baur's school argued in the reverse way. The latter hold that the Jewish-Christian standpoint of the Revelation corresponds exactly with what we might anticipate from the Apostle, and that there is far stronger external testimony for the Johannine authorship here than in the case of the Gospel. There is the testimony of Justin Martyr, who, Baur thinks, did not know the Gospel at all. Hence it is concluded that the Gospel cannot have been written by the Apostle. It is now no longer necessary to discuss this more fully, for the authenticity of the *Apocalypse* itself is strongly contested in recent times. The discussions on the subject are still in full swing, so that it cannot be decided in which direction the consensus of critics will turn. But just because there is doubt no one can at present derive a decisive argument against the Apostolic origin of the Gospel from the character of the *Apocalypse*.

There is still another point on which Baur's school laid considerable emphasis, but which at present has moved somewhat into the background—the relation, namely, of the Apostle John to the celebration of *Easter in Asia Minor*. In the Church of Asia Minor in the second century the Christian Easter was always celebrated at the Jewish date, the 14th of Nisan. When discussion arose, during the last decades of the second century, with the Western Church, the Christians of Asia Minor defended their custom by appealing to the Last Supper. This original celebration had, they said, taken place on the day of the Jewish Passover, the 14th of Nisan. The Christians of Asia Minor followed, therefore, the chronology of the Passion found in the Synoptics. They at once appeal, however, to the example of the Apostle John, who, whilst he stayed in Ephesus, had observed that custom. Since that time the whole Church of Asia Minor had followed him. Baur's school deduced from this, as Bretschneider had done, that even the Apostle John followed the Synoptic chronology, and that consequently the Fourth Gospel, with a different chronology, could not have been written by him. This apparently very conclusive argument has a flaw, however. We do not know from what point of view the celebration of the feast in Asia Minor first originated. At the time of the controversy the Christians of Asia Minor certainly defended their custom by using the Synoptic chronology. It cannot

be proved, however, that the latter was the standard for the feast from the first. It is much more probable that the Jewish date, 14th Nisan, was simply retained when the Jewish was changed into a Christian celebration. Instead of the Jewish Feast of Redemption the Christian feast was observed. The chronological question as to whether Jesus had, on the day of the Jewish Passover, the 14th Nisan, held a meal with His disciples, and been crucified on the day following, or whether both events came a day earlier, could hardly have been under consideration. If this be so, then the Apostle John's participation in the celebration in Asia Minor is of no importance for the question as to the authorship of the Fourth Gospel.

All our observations, so far, have been based on the content and structure of the Gospel itself. We have presented them at comparative length, because the internal grounds will in the end be decisive in our great controversy. If we have rightly appraised them, they are in the highest degree unfavourable to the acceptance of the Apostolic origin of our Gospel. Under the feeling that this is actually the case, many defenders lay all the greater emphasis on the external evidence. The latter is so strong, they think, that it compels us to accept the Apostolic origin, and to count all other points secondary. In England, at any rate, the majority vote would still be on the side of the defenders.* Is that view actually well founded? Emphasis is laid on all modern discoveries and thorough investigations having been favourable to the Gospel. Since the conclusion of the Clementine Homilies and the Diatessaron of Tatian were discovered, it is thought no further doubt could be entertained as to John's Gospel having been used in these writings. Minute investigation of Justin also had proved that even he had known our Gospel. Finally, the Gnostic fragments which had come to light through the discovery of the Philosophumena of Hippolytus had shown that Basilides and Valentinus had also used the Gospel. But what does all this amount to? The date of the rise of the Clementine Homilies is quite unknown. Tatian was a disciple of Justin; but Justin wrote about 140-150 A.D. Whether the fragments of the Gnostics, which are given in the Philosophumena, came from Basilides and Valentinus themselves is very uncertain. Prob-

ably the writings referred to are later productions of the school of Basilides and Valentinus. So there only remains further, the fact that Justin knew our Gospel. Observe it is said "knew," for he never quoted it. We cannot say, therefore, whether he regarded it as a work by the Apostle John. All this evidence, then, does not amount to anything over against the weight of internal testimony. The only external evidence that is of any importance is that of Irenæus, and at the present the most emphasis is laid on that in Germany. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, about 180-190 A.D., takes for granted that the composition of the Fourth Gospel by the Apostle John is undoubted and acknowledged. But it is held there is a direct chain of tradition from Irenæus back to the Apostle John himself. In a fragment, preserved for us by the Church History of Eusebius (v. 20), Irenæus tells us that he, when a boy, had seen and heard Polycarp in Asia Minor, as Polycarp spoke of his intercourse with the Apostle John. "I can still tell the place where the blessed Polycarp used to sit and talk; his going out and coming in, and his manner of life; the look of him and his addresses which he gave to the people; and how he narrated his intercourse with John and the others who had seen the Lord, and what he thought of their words, &c." Although John is not expressly described here as the Apostle there can be no doubt Irenæus meant the Apostle, or otherwise he would have added a more particular description of this John in some way. True, several modern critics, especially Keim, have held that Irenæus was guilty of confusion. Polycarp, they say, was not speaking of the Apostle John, but of another John—the so-called Presbyter of whom we know through Papias. What Irenæus had heard as a youth about the latter John from the mouth of Polycarp he had wrongly applied to the Apostle in his later recollection. Such a confusion is possible, but there is scarcely sufficient ground for its acceptance. It is therefore admitted that Irenæus had really heard Polycarp tell of John. But we do not learn anything of what he heard him relate. Nothing is said of the Gospel of John in this connection at all. There is therefore no kind of decisive evidence here. Those recollections of Irenæus about something which he had heard in his childhood from the mouth of Polycarp respecting John, and the use of the Fourth Gospel by Irenæus as a work of John, are two matters which stand in no necessary connection with one another. The first fact is no security to us

* Cf. e.g., Gloag, "Introduction to the Johannine Writings" (1891), p. 127; and Sanday's declaration in his Inaugural Address on the Study of the New Testament, delivered before the University of Oxford in 1883 (quoted by Gloag, p. ix. of Preface).

that h
respec
a mere
possib
ness d
in th
Papias
the fir
date c
dation
work i
preser
large
Papias
had le
the lit
Mark
of Ch
from
record
Hebre
specia
tion r
ment
not fi
Papias
writin
could
as a v
not to
have
Gospel
ability
swere
the au
pious
The a
used
count
proof
has no
and G
same
quain
rule, s
once,
of us
than
Apost
Justin
and t
from
quain
lated
tory w
but n
were f
establ
pel, h

* Cf.
in Herz

that he possessed any authentic information respecting the second. There is here, then, a mere possibility. But over against this possibility, the opponents of the genuineness draw attention to certain critical points in the series of external evidences. (1) Papias, the Bishop of Hierapolis, wrote, in the first half of the second century (the date cannot be exactly given), "An Elucidation of the Sayings of the Lord." The work itself is lost. Eusebius has, however, preserved for us in his Church History a large piece from the preface, in which Papias, among other things, tells what he had learned by verbal inquiries respecting the literary activity of Mark and Matthew. Mark had recorded the sayings and doings of Christ so far as he remembered them from Peter's accounts, but Matthew had recorded the sayings of the Lord in the Hebrew tongue. Since Eusebius drew special attention to this kind of information respecting the rise of the New Testament Scriptures, it is probable that he did not find any more of it in the work of Papias. If Papias only spoke of Gospel writings by Mark and Matthew, however, could he have known of the Fourth Gospel as a work of the Apostle John? Was it not to be expected that in this case he would have expressed himself also respecting the Gospel of John? Many think that probability demands that this question be answered in the affirmative. And the higher the authority of Papias is set the more suspicious is his silence respecting our Gospel. The assurance of Eusebius that Papias had used the First Epistle of John does not counterbalance this, for the use of it is no proof that he held it to be Johannine. It has not been proved, too, that the Epistle and Gospel were acknowledged to be by the same author.* (2) Justin Martyr's acquaintance with the Fourth Gospel is, as a rule, admitted by modern critics. They at once, however, lay emphasis on his manner of using it as being rather unfavourable than favourable to the acceptance of the Apostolic origin. Whilst almost all that Justin quotes of the sayings of the Lord and the facts of Gospel history is taken from the Synoptics, he only betrays an acquaintance with the Fourth Gospel in isolated passages. Evidently the Gospel history was then current in the Synoptic form, but not in the Johannine. The Synoptics were in use in the Church, having become established long before. The Fourth Gospel, however, had newly appeared, and it is

doubtful whether Justin regarded it as apostolic. It is a fact that Justin makes remarkably sparing, indeed, almost no use, of the Fourth Gospel as a source of history. And we may readily conclude, therefore, that the fact is to be explained as already suggested. (3) But we know further, through Irenæus and Epiphanius, that there was a party in the Church in the second century which did not acknowledge the Gospel of John as Apostolic or Canonical (Iren. iii. 11, 9: *Illam speciem non admittunt, quæ est secundum Johannis Evangelium*). Because they rejected the Logos-Gospel Epiphanius calls them, mockingly, the "*Alogoi*"—that is, "devoid of reason." These opponents of the Gospel of John were not heretics, but a party in the Church.* How could such a party venture to reject the Gospel if its Apostolic origin was known and acknowledged? They had dogmatic grounds, to be sure, for the rejection. But after the Apostolic origin of the New Testament Scriptures was once acknowledged by the Church, parties set on one side the strongest dogmatic points which were not convenient to them, in quite another way—not by rejection, but by interpretation of Scripture. If the *Alogoi* had recourse simply to rejecting the Gospel, its Apostolic origin cannot at that time have been generally acknowledged.

These arguments are well suited to diminish our trust in the "external evidence." The most one can admit in an unprejudiced way is that the external evidence is evenly balanced *pro* and *con*, and leads to no decision. Perhaps, however, it is truer to say, it is more unfavourable than favourable to the authenticity.

But to one chief point of the defenders we have not yet referred, namely, *the Gospel's own statements* concerning its writer. It is said that the Gospel professes to be from the hand of an eye-witness—the Apostle John. It is written in the prologue, "We beheld His glory" (i. 14), and when the fact is recorded that blood and water flowed from Jesus' side when pierced, the author assures us that he saw this himself (xix. 35). Since he, however, never mentions the Apostle John, but merely states that an unnamed person enjoyed in an un-

* Cf. here especially, Harnack's Article "The Monarchians" in Herzog's "Real-Encyclopædie."

* It is hardly worth while citing an alleged positive testimony of Papias for our Gospel, which some modern apologists have adduced. In some Latin MSS. of the Bible belonging to the Middle Ages a prologue is inserted at the beginning of our Gospel, in which it is recorded that Papias reported the Fourth Gospel to be by John. (*Evangelium Johannis manifestatum et datum ecclesiis ab Johanne adhuc in corpore constituto, sicut Papias nomine Hierapolitanus discipulus Johannis carus . . . retulit*.) The author of this prologue proves himself, by other foolish assertions, so ignorant that his statements deserve no credence.

exceptional degree the love of the master, he indicates, it is thought, in a sensitive and reticent way that he is himself the unnamed person. So it is held that the author intends he should himself be taken for the Apostle John. So noble and sensitive a soul, however, would deserve to be believed. Finally, his own testimony is strengthened by another piece of added evidence, that the beloved disciple had written the Gospel (John xxi. 24). The opponents of the authenticity judge quite differently respecting these points also. The closing note (xxi. 24), just because added by a later hand, is in no way decisive. The Gospel itself, too, does not anywhere pretend to be a work of the Apostle John. For that "we" of the prologue simply means "we men on earth." The author is speaking there in the name of humanity, not in the name of the "personal disciples of Jesus." In the account of the piercing of Jesus' side also, the author expressly distinguishes himself from the person who guarantees the fact. "He that saw it bare record and his record is true, and he knoweth that he saith true" (xix. 35). That does not sound as if the author meant himself to be regarded as an eye-witness. Finally, the way in which the beloved disciple is spoken of, can only be regarded as sensitive and refined, if the author is not himself this beloved disciple. These latter explanations can scarcely be thought wrong, if an unprejudiced judgment be given.

Unmistakably then, the conscientious labour of theological science has strengthened the suspicion against the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel, and the number is constantly increasing of those who believe it in the highest degree improbable that the Apostle wrote the Gospel. But one thing may, in conclusion, be emphasised. Even if Protestant Theology should become convinced that this Gospel was not written by an Apostle, the peculiar worth of it will still remain. For its worth lies not in its historical narrative, but in its doctrine or teaching. On that point opponents as well as defenders of the genuineness are at one. What is the fundamental thought it presents? Not philosophical speculations. These are only aids to the author. Rather is it a cardinal point of our Christian faith which is presented—the conviction that in the person of Jesus Christ God revealed Himself. Jesus Christ—and He alone—by His perfect union with His heavenly Father gave Divine light and life perfectly to men. Only he who comes to Jesus will find life and full satisfaction

(x. 10). That is the fundamental thought of our Gospel. That is, however, a fundamental point also of our Christian faith. And nowhere in the New Testament is it expressed with such clearness and distinctness, with such ardour and fulness of faith, with such victorious confidence as in our Gospel. Therefore, even if this Gospel must fall more and more behind the Synoptics as a source of history, it will always have its worth as a witness of the Christian faith.

THE RELIGIOUS USES OF HARD-SHIP.

BY JOSEPH PARKER, D.D., MINISTER OF THE CITY TEMPLE, LONDON.

From *The Young Man* (London), September, 1891.

"And they were to prove Israel by them."—*Jud. iii. 4.*

IN the previous chapter the Lord says, "I also will not henceforth drive out any from before them of the nations that Joshua left when he died: that through them I may prove Israel." The Lord did not drive out the nations hastily; He kept the heathen to be the schoolmasters of Israel; He kept the heathen to be the tormentors of His people—thorns and goads by which their temper and their general quality might be tested. The enemies did not know what they were doing. The enemy took a short view of the whole situation. He was but a warrior; he was but contending for his own freehold; he was but a patriot, according to his own conception of patriotism; he insisted upon keeping his own foot upon his own ground; so, whether men were good, bad, or indifferent, he would have none of them in his land. That is the Pagan view of life. The Divine view is that the Pagan is kept in order to teach the man who ought to be no Pagan, but a real, simple-hearted, honest believer in God. The Pagan was a rod in the hands of the living God. Israel took a fretful view of the circumstance; Israel repined and moaned, and was chafed in spirit. He did not know all the case. What man amongst us knows what the Lord is doing with him and for him? The spring is hidden in the clouds which darken the heavens; presently it will come down upon us in the form of rain, then we shall begin to see why the clouds were darkening the sky. Do you know what your enemies live for? They live to keep you right. Do you know why the thorns grow? That you may be pricked,

to teach
haviour,
things
rocks
cannot
educati
thing m
bad for
nents, e
that I n
of refin
a perfect
dead, th
and bea
ond Ad
Lord dr
"five l
Canaan
Hivites
Why all
to keep
too muc
all the
east win
we thin
west wi
places i
be our
think,
small?
of thin
shall s
would l
will be
fighting
you ma
may be
elevatio
ness.
does no
gone to
sing me
What
He is c
what h
right f
things
you lef
have al
where
your s
much
down t
and sil
along
came a
and yo
can tak
You c
dent, t
I cannot

to teach you good manners, excellent behaviour, careful, circumspect conduct. All things are for your sakes. Why are the rocks in the ground so that the plough cannot make a straight furrow? For your education. Why can I not have everything my own way? Because it would be bad for me if I could. Why so many opponents, enemies, antagonists, rivals? Simply that I may be educated to the highest point of refinement, and be presented at the last a perfect man in Christ Jesus, the old Adam dead, the new man fashioned in the figure, and beautiful with the loveliness of the second Adam. That is all. Why did not the Lord drive out all these nations? Why the "five lords of the Philistines, and the Canaanites, and the Sidonians, and the Hivites that dwell in Mount Lebanon?" Why all the Pagan host? Simply, I repeat, to keep Israel right. We must not have too much heaven upon the earth. We need all the rocks and all the thorns, and all the east winds that ever blew. We think not; we think we could live better in the southwest wind, and do better without the stony places in the field; we think all men should be our friends. But what right have we to think, beyond a given point, so near, so small? When we have exercised our right of thinking up to the prescribed point, we shall say, We stop here; we thought it would have been otherwise, but God's good will be done. You are not to fight for fighting's sake; you are not to fight that you may win; you are to fight that you may be educated; contention should mean elevation, refinement, self-restraint, godliness. All controversy is from below that does not help a man when the storm has gone to praise God more profoundly and sing more lovingly.

What the Lord did in the case of Israel He is doing in our case every day. Look what hardships are yours. Nothing goes right five days in the week. You put things down expecting to find them where you left them, and when you return, they have all disappeared, and not a soul knows where they have been taken to. It is for your sake. You were going to make too much of them; you were going to write down that lead was iron, and iron was silver, and silver was gold; you were reckoning along the wrong line altogether, so God came and took away all that you had left, and your fortune became emptiness. You can take one of two views of such instances. You can say, This is mishap, this is accident, this is chance; it has so fallen out; I cannot account for it. Or you can say,

Behind all this difficulty and loss and hardship there is a meaning. The Lord reigneth. The sparrows He watches; the hairs upon the head He counts; the steps of the good man He orders; therefore behind all this prostration of purpose and adaptation there must be some good reason. What is it? Where you cannot explain, you can pray; where you cannot illuminate the mystery, you can sit still or stand still and quietly wait. You can search your heart as with the candle of the Lord. In that heart you will find all the reason if you really want to find it. There is the case of the prodigal. Why should my son, say you, be the plague of my life? He is breaking my heart, breaking his mother's heart, turning our bread into bitterness. What is the meaning of this? Surely I am not to blame! You are more, perhaps, than you think. That son may be in some respects keeping you right, educating you, teaching you how to pray. You have been very rough with other people's sons; you could see them damned and never shed a tear. The only way in which God can get at you is through that boy of yours. When you prayed aforetime, your prayers were so stiff and hard. Not a tear in all the supplication—nothing but Pharisaic pomp and artificiality; but since your own heart has been grieved with a deeper grief, you have been taught how to pray. Now men love to hear you speak of heaven: the tone is so rich, so kind, so hopeful. You can take one of two views even of the prodigal. You can stand up and say, I have done no wrong; I cannot be held responsible for this evil conduct; I have taken the right course; I have done my duty. If ever you hear a man talk too much about having done his duty, he cannot see the kingdom of God. *You* done your duty! Why, you are claiming to be almost a god. Or you can say, I must have been wrong, perhaps, without knowing it altogether, perhaps in a larger degree than I have ever suspected; let me recall my life, and settle accounts with my own conscience. God may be thus training both of us. God will not take a prodigal and make educative use of him, and then throw him away. I cannot think that God can so use the meanest of His creatures. To use him as an opponent that will bring you to prayer may itself be the beginning of a noble issue in his own case. I have seen a thousand prodigals come home; I have never known a Pharisee saved. Far be it from me to say that no Pharisee has been broken down and received into the kingdom of God. I trust thou-

sands have. I am only speaking within the limits of my own personal observation. By Pharisee I do not refer to office—I refer to character, and by character in this case I mean self-righteousness, self-idolatry, self-sufficiency. The self-sufficient man never can be saved. To whom then will God look, and upon whom will He show mercy? To the broken in heart and the contrite, and to those who surrender themselves to Him, saying, “God be merciful unto me a sinner!” The dew will fall upon him, and the anointing oil, and the enlightening sun of the glory, and all heaven will open for him. If we would be saved, it must be along such lines. We must accept providence as having meaning. To believe in providence, and to trust to chance, is the direst atheism. Your providence must not be in your creed,—it must be in your soul; you must live upon it as upon daily bread.

God must be left to determine what tests are best for each man. What would be tests in one case might be no tests in another. The distribution of tests, therefore, must be left to the Most High and the All Good. Some men must be tried through business. Business is now fast becoming a game, and not a game of skill. You are opposed on every hand. Business has now become a bloodless war. We fight with swords other than swords of steel. Every business man is exposed to the peril of becoming a warrior, and having his own brother as his antagonist. Some men cannot succeed in business. Whilst they are servants, they do fairly well; the moment they become masters, they make fools of themselves. They have not intellectual captaincy; they have no commercial capacity; they see a point, not a line; they are intense, not extensive, and therefore they have their little ups and downs which they call their fortunes and their misfortunes; but they never grip life and hold it, and master it, and defy it. Is this a mere matter of chance? God tries men in various ways. Some men would be damned if they could double their business. They do not think so; they would not believe the audacious preacher who would teach such a doctrine; but that is the fact. They will only be saved by being kept under given restraints. God knows exactly every shilling I can be trusted with: if with twenty, I have not twenty-one. I think I could do so much with the extra shilling, and God will not give it to me, and He will tell me in heaven why it was that my income was a pound and not a guinea. I live now in

God; the pound will go further than the guinea if I accept it in the right way; the Lord knows that I cannot be trusted beyond a given tether. Let my heart leap up and say, “Father, fix the tether, and give me all the ground that is good for me, and may I make every inch of it praying ground.”

Other men can only be tried and tested through the body. You must have that rheum, that sharp pain, that disabling agony. It is through the body that God finds the highway to your soul. He found the soul of the other man along the line of business. You have never had any trouble in that direction. You could lose, and not know it; you could gain, and be none the richer. Through your body, therefore, God must find that recreant soul of yours. Take this view of your pain, your sleeplessness, your aching head, your general disability. Who knows but that God has left these hordes of the Philistines, and the Canaanites, and the Sidonians, and the Hivites—left them in your blood to make a man of you? You know how harsh you used to be. When your own apprentice fell ill, you treated him with suspicion and disbelief, and told him to get up and do his work if he would receive his rations. How now? Will you get up? Bestir yourself! The pain lies along the whole length of the sciatic nerve. Get up! You will be gentler now, kindlier; you will find your way to your purse when you see some fellow-cripple in greater pecuniary need than you are.

Some men are tried by rivalry. Their rivals will not die. You have said, Surely in another five years that man will be dead and gone, whereas in another five years he is younger than ever. How is this? You can take two views of it—one the atheistic, the other the theistic or providential. That man may be keeping you up to the mark. The cobwebs would be covering your business windows if he were not up earlier than you are, brightening his panes of glass. You owe that man a great deal; you would have taken things very easily if he had not been there; you have called him a kind of enemy—in reality he has been much of a friend.

Others are tried by long waiting. Patience is almost murdered in the soul. The letter of release will come to-morrow, and to-morrow comes, but no letter. The heart that is hard towards you will be softened by its sunset, and then you will be relieved and blessed. Sunset comes, but no softening of the heart. It is now seven years you

have be
you ha
consum
the he
up. F
between
may y
loyalty

Thur
religio
have h
one cr
Every
the sp
the ha
hand r
Will t
one co
very c
ours?
and s
God o
I am
Thou
All th
to the
final
the g
will o
Christ
tion a
Yet t
begin
like;
worsh
you n
elevat
acter.
too e
costs
to re
some
tree
groun
poor
the fo
when
heath
is wh
fares
The f
what
the l
he ou
god l
coun
that
he n
and
easy

have been waiting for that particular event ; you have almost calculated the hour of its consummation. "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick." You have almost given up. Blessed be God that "almost" stands between you and despair. Hold to it ; you may yet be educated, refined, brought to loyalty, to obedience, and to prayer.

Thus we are brought back to consider the religious uses of hardship. Some of us have had so much difficulty. We have not one crumb of bread we have not fought for. Everything in the house we have taken at the spear-point. Some men seem to carry the hardships of ten lives. Will the severe hand never be taken off the bending neck ? Will the yoke never be eased ? Is it to be one continual goad and chafe down to the very end ? How much of the blame is ours ? Why do we not surrender, give in, and say, Galilean, Thou hast conquered ; God of the worlds, Thou art mightier than I am ; take my heart ; it is broken, but Thou canst live in the crumbling fragments. All that is wanted on our part is obedience to the infinite, the everlasting, the supreme, final Necessity. We prefer to substitute the grand evangelical terms, and say, The will of God, the redeeming sovereignty of Christ, the presence and rule, the inspiration and sustenance of God the Holy Ghost. Yet take which set of terms you please ; begin your higher education where you like ; only do begin it. I would rather you worship a stone in the streets, than that you never worship at all. Reverence is elevating, veneration is the bloom of character. It is customary for men who laugh too easily—and therefore their laughter costs them nothing and is worth nothing—to regard with comic feeling the idea of some poor savage falling down before a tree or star, or some little flower in the ground. They laugh the more when the poor savage worships some rude beast of the forest, and they laugh the more loudly when they are told that in some countries heathen men sell their gods for gold. That is what we are doing in all the thoroughfares of London every day in the week. The form is not so ; but what of the spirit, what of the intent, what of the purpose of the heart ? The man who is silent when he ought to speak for justice has sold what god he had. The man who will not encounter inconvenience and undergo sacrifice that he may proclaim the Christ to whom he nominally trusts, has sold that Christ, and is a baser Iscariot than Judas. It is easy to laugh at the heathen, to smile at

the idea of their parting with their gods. We have sold God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost nearly every day of our conscious and responsible life. When we lied—do you remember ? When we told half the truth—you know the time. When we oppressed the weak—you can never forget the look of that man as he went down under your cruel pressure ; you will see his eyes on your dying day. It was then we sold the Trinity we sang to on the Sabbath preceding.

Our hardships may become our blessings if we accept them in a religious spirit. I have to thank God for every hardship I have undergone. They were terrible at the time ; they have been in some degree sanctified ; sometimes I can now pray ; in some moments I can wrestle with God and throw Him by His kind consent. Sometimes, indeed, I have wrestled with Him at daybreak, and although He has left His mark upon me, He has left His blessing in me, giving me larger name and larger power. I would undertake to say that if any man has accepted his hardships in the right spirit, he is the better for them—not always will the word "better" be defined in the same way, but in some way—in taking certain elements out of his disposition, in putting certain other elements into his disposition, by rebuking his ambitions, by chastening his presumption, by leading him to see that things are larger than he supposed them to be, and especially by making him quiet where once he was riotous in declamation. Never remark on any other man's hardships so as to increase them. If you cannot relieve a man's burdens, do not add to them. Do not remind him of things that will only depress his spirit. If you see a poor cripple on the road, do not laugh at his infirmity ; it is enough for him to bear it without having added to it your neglect, contumely, and insult. If a man is poor, do not shake your purse in his eyes, unless you mean to share it with him, and even then the shaking may be done without. "The heart knoweth its own bitterness." You have your difficulties in business, at home, in the body, in commercial or scholastic rivalry and emulation ; you have your difficulties of temper, and you know that many a time when you think you are going to smite and overthrow, you do but bruise your poor knuckles on the unyielding rock. All men have their hardships ; all men have their difficulties. Let us accept them in the right spirit ; let us make as few difficulties as we can between one another, and when God uses us providentially for conflict and

antagonism, let us believe that in the end the explanation will come like a rising light. Life is a plan, life is a school, life is a preparation. We are made by our enemies. Many of us could say, I should have failed through indolence if I had not been pricked and goaded by some rival—by some rival whom I hated at the time. One day that rival and I shall shake hands and say it was all right, though we knew it not.

Thus would I accept life. Jesus Christ would not have redeemed it with blood if it had been a thing superficial. The Christ would have been the gigantic mistake of eternity if life were a mere game of chance. If I would know what my life is and what it is worth, I will not consult some intellectual calculator to tell me the price in figures, I will look at the Christ of Christ and see in that Christ what every man is worth. If I get the right view, I will say I am not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, which could buy kings and thrones, crowns and palaces, but with the precious, the princely blood of Christ. In that word "blood" find no coarseness, find life, agony, all.

JOHN MASON NEALE, D.D.

BY REV. GEORGE HUNTINGTON, M.A.

From *The Newberry House Magazine* (London), September, 1891.

IN recalling the memory of this great scholar and divine, I wish it to be understood that I am drawing on my own recollections as well as on those of mutual friends. I am also indebted to the interesting memoir placed in my hands by the Sister who edits *S. Margaret's Magazine*, and to an obituary notice by a brother poet and hymnologist, the Rev. Gerald Moultrie.* No one indeed could know Dr. Neale by mere hearsay. To know him you must have seen him at East Grinstead, as to know Keble you must have seen him at Hursley. The two were much alike in their reserve, and dislike of notoriety. But Neale was at times so abstracted and absorbed that it was no easy matter to draw him out. Stories are told of people who made pilgrimages to the picturesque and quaint old college to interview him, as the Yankees say, and who went back with hardly the interchange of a word. But

when visitors properly accredited came, they found him a man of infinite resources.

"Hither came scholars and the letters of scholars, from far and near, Oxford and Cambridge, London and Dublin, Russia and America, propounding knotty points for elucidation in theology, politics, hymnology, liturgiology, canon law, and history. And the Warden, master of some twenty languages, and of an immense mass of varied learning, the first liturgical scholar of his day, and endowed with foresight, amounting (as subsequent events have proved) almost to prophecy, writes there standing behind his desk, shy, retiring, assuming nothing but his own inadequacy to instruct, and yet ready with a satisfactory answer to almost every question. Besides replies to these individual applications, his unresisting pen pours forth work upon work with marvellous rapidity, learning, and versatility, church history, theological essays, children's hymns and stories, and catechisms, newspaper articles, Seatonian prize poems, translations into or out of Greek and Latin, pamphlets on questions of the day, Scripture commentaries and historical tales, biographies, cantilenæ in dog-Latin, travels and sermons. And Sackville College was itself no unsuitable home for such a man. Quiet, withdrawn from the stir and bustle of ordinary life, it was well fitted for the abode of a scholar. . . . As he laboured for his College, and in its little chapel, so much more did he labour for England and its Church, not rightly appreciated at the time. But over his study-door was the inscription, 'Through evil report and good report,' and over his mantelpiece, 'Per angusta ad angusta.'"

Really to know what manner of man he was he had to be seen greeting the aged inmates, and speaking to them in their chapel those inimitable addresses afterwards known as "Readings for the Aged;" or in the convent, where he ruled the Sisters by gentle and yet wise and firm discipline; or in S. Agnes' School, where he varied his religious teaching with stories from history and tales of Christian heroism; or in the orphanage, where the little ones clustered around their "dear Father," as they always called him. In the very Oratory itself he used to have a child on each side of him putting up its tiny hands to touch his, or to finger his robes. Of no one could Goldsmith's lines be more truly said:

"E'en children followed with endearing wile,
And pluck'd his gown to share the good man's
smile."

His love of animals was quite as marked.

* Reprinted from the *Churchman's Companion*, 1866. Signed, G. M.

Not a
stone a
near.
ing a d
corner,
said he
an ass
plucking
"Well
you fro
it is n
marked
to its m
dies, th
again.
good V
kind v
walked
animal
to call
Green
carrots
forget
Tarpor
on his
the su
regula

He
that e
never
good v
dence
pend
He g
often
and w
the Co
with
beggar
the or
to pay
guesse
him l
lated
impos
all he

He
him t
face t
Neale
break
penny
cant.
cal ec
"H
creeds
ple in
dinner
the C

* On
groans

Not a boy would beat a donkey, or throw a stone at a dog, if he were suspected to be near. One day some urchins were belabouring a donkey, when, just as they turned the corner, there was Dr. Neale. "Dear boys," said he, "do you know who used to ride on an ass?" "Yes, sir," replied the boys, plucking their forelocks, "Jesus Christ." "Well then, think of that, and let it keep you from being cruel; and see there—ah! it is nearly worn away by this collar—He marked the ass with His cross"—alluding to its mane. "Now, promise me, my ladies, that you'll never ill-treat your donkey again." The boys kept their word, and the good Warden never passed them without a kind word or a penny. Sometimes he walked by the cart with his hand on the animal's shoulder, and sometimes he used to call to drivers as they passed the College Green to stop that he might give their asses carrots. The Cheshire farmers will never forget their finding him, when on a visit to Tarporley Rectory during the cattle plague, on his knees in the cow-houses praying for the suffering animals.* After this they regularly sent for him to do so.

He was one of the most generous men that ever lived, and, like Dr. Hook, could never keep a penny in his pocket. His good wife tried to teach him common prudence by giving him a certain sum to expend every day; but it was quite useless. He gave to all who asked, and was very often beset by beggars who knew his habits, and who waylaid him as he walked from the College to the Convent. I was walking with him to the railway-station when a beggar accosted him on whom he bestowed the only coin he had with him, a shilling to pay his fare with. The stationmaster guessed what had happened, and handed him his ticket with a smile. I expostulated: "Neale, I'm sure that fellow is an impostor." "That rests with God" was all he said in reply.

He took the precept literally, "Give to him that asketh of thee, and never turn thy face from any poor man." Neither Mrs. Neale nor his servants were at liberty to break through the rule of giving, if only a penny or a slice of bread, to every applicant. Certainly he had no faith in "political economy."

"His charity knew no distinction of creeds. There were always some poor people invited, out of the town, to the Sunday dinners, until there were inmates enough in the College to fill up the tables. Their

only claim to admission was their poverty. It was never asked whether they went to Little Bethel or the Parish Church. Aged, sick, infirm, Churchmen or Dissenters, all found a welcome at his board, and sympathy from that loving heart."

"Amongst the earliest recipients of his aid was an Independent minister in declining health, who was said to have been worried out of six of his seven senses by his people, because mentally he was too independent—a condition of mind which is not approved of by the Independents. He seems to have been a man of high and elevated character. He was often visited by Dr. Neale, and on leaving East Grinstead one of Dr. Neale's relations at his request supplied him with delicacies for his fading and consumptive body, and with books and cheerful attention to smooth his pathway to the tomb. Another Dissenting minister—a Presbyterian—became a warm admirer of Dr. Neale. He used to resort to Dr. Neale for the loan of books, and for conversation on topics of interest. He was taken ill, and experienced the hospitality of the College. This man had the courage to stand forth as a defender of Dr. Neale in a Dissenting paper in 1857 (a time of great excitement), when he ably reviewed Dr. Neale's works."

That Dr. Neale was slovenly in his personal appearance, and that when a new suit of clothes became an absolute necessity they had to be placed on a chair for him to put on unwitting of their novelty, most of his intimates were aware.

His friend G. M. says: "He was singularly careless of his own personal comfort, going about without umbrella and in his thin cassock, in all weathers. Last winter (his last), however, to the great surprise of the sisterhood he came out with a pair of overshoes to walk down to the new buildings in. It was his favourite walk, as it was the dear wish of his life to see his beloved Sisters and orphans comfortably housed—a wish, alas! not destined to be accomplished. He said that his feet were often wet through three times a day. This seemed quite sufficient reason, but it quietly transpired that the chief thing in his mind was that it gave the servants so much trouble."

How he got through so much literary work was a mystery to people who did not know his ways, and the little time he took for rest. Who that was ever inside it will forget that wonderful library, his book-room as he called it? It was quaint in its architecture and quaint in its fittings, piled

* On this occasion he wrote his hymn, "All Creation groans and travails."

up from floor to roof with folios, quartos, octavos, in all kinds of bindings, and all kinds of languages, and strewed with pamphlets, papers, and manuscripts, "in sweet confusion blended." It was a "chaos" worse than Bishop Thirlwall's at Abergwili Palace, of which his lordship wrote to a lady friend, who offered to put it into order for him: "As it is, it is difficult to me to find my papers, but if *you* were to attempt to reduce chaos to order it would be impossible." Here, in this study of his, the learned Warden sat, or rather stood at his desk, or walked up and down, dictating to the sister who acted as his amanuensis, whom he had taught to write in Greek and German, and I am not sure if not also in Hebrew and Syriac characters.* Here he read on, whilst the peacocks were uttering their sharp screams under his window, looking out for bits of bread to be thrown to them. Here, too, long after the aged pensioners were snoring in their dormitories, he remained till he took his nightly rounds in the quadrangle before retiring for some four hours' sleep. He used to take his friends out to hear them snore. I shall not forget the sounds. But it was when he could be coaxed away from his beloved books that you saw him at his best. Then, if you knew how to draw him out—not always easy—you found him a most genial companion; he would sit up with you to the "sma' hours," telling endless stories and legends, diving into old books and manuscripts, giving you bits of classical, ecclesiastical, or ecclesiologial lore, and, if the truth must be told, setting your hair on end by ghost stories, in which he firmly believed. My friend H. D. N. once sat up with him till two o'clock in the morning, when they parted to go to their bed-rooms, but no sooner had the guest fallen into his first sleep than he was awakened by the sound of footsteps approaching, and a dim light drawing nearer and nearer; the door opened, and an apparition was seen, none other than Dr. Neale in his cassock, and a lantern in his hand. He had clean forgotten that he had given up his own bed-room to his friend, and taken another. Of course the absent-minded host was profuse in his apologies, but I believe that he enjoyed his friend's discomfiture. "I'm

afraid," said he, "you took me for a ghost." "To tell you the truth, I did," was the reply. But no sooner was the nocturnal visitor's back turned than the guest got out of bed, and firmly bolted his door. Dr. Neale and the late Bishop Wilberforce have been known to sit up the night through telling each other stories of the supernatural. One or two of these are extant. My intimacy with Dr. Neale began by my placing one of my then little daughters at S. Agnes' School, under the Sisters. At that time he looked very much like his portraits. He was a tall, angular, rather loosely limbed man, dressed in the old-fashioned way that Pusey and Keble, and Isaac Williams used to dress, in swallow-tailed coats, tall hats, and white ties. He was sallow in complexion, with dark and not very tidily brushed hair, short-sighted, wore spectacles, and had a distraught and dreamy look, as though his thoughts were far away. His head was intellectual, and when a smile crossed his somewhat melancholic aspect, it animated his entire features, like a sunbeam on a winter's day. Within the College precincts, and at the Sisterhood, he always dressed in his cassock with a trencher cap on his head, and a pair of bands under his chin. Amongst his many accomplishments was that of Latin writing. I once put him to the test by dictating a paragraph out of the *Times* newspaper; he rendered it in that learned tongue as readily as a school-boy would a dictation lesson. He used to use up odds and ends of time, when waiting for a train, thereby sometimes missing it, or when awaiting the arrival of a hostess, by noting down on backs of envelopes or bits of waste paper any thought that occurred to him. This came out in rather a notable way on a visit he paid to Hursley, whither he had been invited by Mr. Keble with the Bishop of Salisbury to help them with a new hymnal. Mr. Keble used to be fond of telling the story, but I had it from Dr. Neale himself. As told me, Neale arrived a few minutes before his host, who was busy in his parish. On his return Dr. Neale said, "Why, Keble, I thought you told me that the 'Christian Year' was entirely original?" "Yes," he answered, "it certainly is." "Then how comes this?" And Dr. Neale placed before him the Latin of one of Keble's hymns for a Saint's Day (S. Luke's). Keble was utterly confounded. There was the English which he knew that he had made, and there too, no less certainly, was the Latin, with far too unpleasant a resemblance to his own to be fortuitous. He protested that he had

* This habit of his of walking up and down while he thought and dictated his thoughts was inveterate. As I sat in the library reading the *Guardian*, he came to a standstill, and began biting his nalle, a way he had when he was puzzled. The amanuensis looked up from her work. Then it turned out that I had put my chair in the way of his course across the room. I removed it by accident; profuse were the doctor's thanks; he instantly resumed his perambulations and his dictation without impediment.

never
life, c
Neale
just to
But
backs,
Neale
of ser
intenc
pool,
Fortu
the la
the di
had a
the C
"Jer
Th
to wh
Sister
facts
of E
the c
Sello
which
tant
impu
happ
derw
was
Evan
up,
stone
Brig
else.
sents
op re
was
of "
lived
with
be s
—"
way
a co
Brig
Jun
was
inde
eyes
land
of t
Cou
plat
veil
Pop
wer
bas
dren
stat
wel
riag

never seen this original, no not in all his life, etc. etc. After a few minutes more Neale relieved him by owning that he had just turned it into Latin in his absence.

But preoccupation of mind has its drawbacks, as I found to my cost, for when Dr. Neale was due to preach for me at an octave of services I was holding in Manchester, the intending preacher took a ticket to Liverpool, and found himself there instead. Fortunately I had an excellent substitute in the late eloquent Provost Fortescue, but the disappointment of the congregation who had assembled to hear the divine to whom the Church of England is indebted for "Jerusalem the Golden" was indescribable.

The reaction in favour of the great work to which Dr. Neale devoted his life, that of Sisterhoods, is one of the most notable facts in the modern history of the Church of England. Some of us can call to mind the obloquy cast on Dr. Pusey and Miss Sellon, the howlings and hootings with which their names were assailed at Protestant meetings, the "evil surmisings" which imputed the worst motives to them. Perhaps the persecution which Dr. Neale underwent was all the more intense because he was looked upon as a renegade from the Evangelicism in which he had been brought up. He and the Sisters were pelted with stones and mud at Lewes, mobbed at Brighton, and burnt in effigy somewhere else. For twelve years, owing to misrepresentations subsequently retracted, his Bishop refused to license him. Neale's revenge was to dedicate to his lordship his volume of "Seatonian Prize Poems." The Bishop lived to regret this act of authority, and to withdraw his inhibition. It might indeed be said of Neale what was said of Cranmer—"To do him an act of injury was the way to reap a benefit from him." One day a country parson was travelling on the Brighton line, and had got to Three Bridges Junction where the train stopped. Here was a sight on which he gazed with feelings indescribable. Could he indeed believe his eyes? Was he really in Protestant England? Was he really living in the middle of this enlightened nineteenth century? Could it be true? Why there, there on the platform was a group of nuns in habits and veils, and all the paraphernalia of the Popery of the "dark ages." But what were they about? Some were carrying baskets, and some were leading tiny children by the hand. And the guards and stationmaster and porters were smiling a welcome, and helping the party into carriages reserved for them, with that readiness

and good nature and disregard of trouble which these officials—most of them, I dare say, husbands and fathers—show on school pleasure trips, and with many tokens of respect for the Sisters. The journey had passed cheerily enough, for up to that moment he had been engaged in the delightful occupation of cutting open and perusing his *Record* newspaper, damp and fresh from the press. As it happened too, he had just finished a philippic against Sisterhoods in general, and East Grinstead in particular, and Dr. Neale as the *fons et origo mali*. Could these be the very Sisters? Yes! it was the junction for East Grinstead, and there they were as large as life, and the worst of it was both Sisters and children looked provokingly happy—about the very ring of their laughter there could be no doubt. So that whatever their secret penances, whatever their deeds of darkness, they looked like "children of the light." The Sisters had no "Witch of Endor" look about them, they were not "weird Sisters," and the faces of their little charges were radiant with smiles. But for his Protestantism the good man would have smiled too; but just before the guard sounded his whistle a porter approached the door out of which this passenger was leaning head and shoulders. "By your leave, sir," and in was pushed an absent-looking gentleman, quite out of breath, and barely in time to save the train. "All right this time, sir," said the guard with a respectful salute as he put the whistle to his mouth, "but if I might advise (with great emphasis on the word *advise*), if I was *you*, sir, I'd not cut it quite so close." The train moved on, and the two sat down opposite to each other. "An extraordinary sight that, sir, and extraordinary times these we live in," said the first occupant of the carriage, expecting to find a sympathising listener. His companion hardly knew what to say, and thought silence the best policy. So the old clergyman said, thinking he had not been heard and raising his voice, "Are those really the so-called Sisters under the notorious Dr. Neale?" What the reply would have been I do not know, for just at this moment peals of laughter were heard from the next compartment, and shortly after this the train stopped, and out trooped the Sisters and the children. "Please to allow me to pass, sir," said the other gentleman, who was, I need not say, Dr. Neale. But this, of course, his companion was not aware of. So when he was left alone he called up a guard. "Who is that clergyman that just got out?" "Why I thought, sir, every

one on this line knew him. Why that's Dr. Neale, and those ladies are the Sisters, and the children are the orphans." "They look very happy," said the old parson. "They'd need to be, sir," was the reply. But here the whistle sounded again, and the good man was left to his reflections and his *Record*. But somehow or other, he did not feel very comfortable for having spoken of a brother clergyman to his face as "notorious." He did not like having done so, for he was a Trinity man, and Dr. Neale was a Trinity man; and, as every one knows, Trinity men are somewhat punctilious. So he wrote to Dr. Neale to recall the expression, and Dr. Neale wrote back an amusing letter, with a Latin pun on the word in it. I do not know whether the two exchanged anything more than correspondence, but I dare say one of them came to see that even a partisan newspaper is not always infallible. I happened to be a guest at the College just about the time when the work of the Sisterhood was beginning to tell, and when a reaction in favour of its founder was setting in. It was the 5th of November, and Sussex was then notorious for the display of its Protestantism, and for the zeal with which this great Protestant festival used to be kept up. Well, on the College Green, and throwing a lurid light on the quaint old buildings, bonfires were lit, tar barrels set on fire, and squibs let off, and thither frequented the whole populace of East Grinstead. The S. Agnes girls had coaxed Dr. Neale to let them go to see the fireworks, and I volunteered to head them up from the school to the College. So I marshalled them in due order, when in rather a lonely part of the road we encountered a lot of young fellows letting off crackers. I rather hesitated what to do with my little group, but I had no cause for alarm, for no sooner were we recognised than the word passed from mouth to mouth, "The Sisters," "The Sisters," and then the youths and hobbledoys stood aside respectfully to let the procession pass, and not a squib was fired till we were far out of gunshot. When we arrived at the College Green, several men had made "*Guy*s" of themselves in various guises, and amongst them I discerned a man grotesquely got up in a sack, out of which the end had been cut, pulled over his head and shoulders, surmounted by a queer-shaped head-dress not unlike an Eastern caftan. The man was walking solemnly about with his hands clasped, whilst the lads and lasses seemed to be on the broad grin. I asked what it meant, at which the rowdies grinned all the

more. Then I found the "*Guy*" was a take-off of a Greek archimandrite, who had been on a visit to the Warden the week before. So I said to the wearer of the strange vestments, "I'm afraid that's hardly kind to a stranger, and I'm sure you would not wish to offend the good Doctor." "Eh! dear," replied the man, "but I never thought of that," and in a minute he went away, and divested himself of his disguise. When I told Dr. Neale, he said that a very few years before it would have been at the peril of their lives for him or the Sisters to have been out in the crowd on Guy Faux Day.

A little later on, one of the Sisters was travelling in a third-class carriage to Tenby, when on this side of Cardiff, two "lewd fellows of the baser sort" got in and made some slighting remarks on the Sister's dress, meanwhile staring her rather impudently in the face. But this roused a sailor at the further end of the carriage, and over the divisions and seats he strode, and with upraised fist he thus addressed the men:—

"Now, my hearties, just you hold your din, and keep your tongues within your jaws; for, by the Lord Harry, if you affront this lady, I'll give you both such a milling that your mothers that bore you won't know you. That lady's a Sister, and when I was down with fever at Cardiff, one of 'em, if it was not her, nursed me through it as if I had been a babby (baby)."

The two men got out at the next station, and the Sister entered into conversation with the sailor, who, it is needless to say, showed her every politeness. She was thankful, however, that there was no occasion for the display of her protector's prowess.

As I have already hinted, Dr. Neale was originally brought up as the Wilberforces and other noted High Churchmen were, as a strict Evangelical. But it was by the best representatives of the school. His father, the Rev. Cornelius Neale, like the Rev. Henry Martin, took the highest University honours; he was Senior Wrangler, First Smith's Prizeman, and Chancellor's Medallist. His mother was daughter of Dr. John Mason Good, after whom he was named, an able physician, an accomplished linguist and versifier. So that, like other clever men, Dr. Neale inherited great abilities as well as the traditions of a party which, at that time, numbered many noted men, and was distinguished for much earnestness and piety.

One curious circumstance was his invinci-

ble dis-
says a
hopes
the iron
for the
cal hon
able to
sally ac
his pov
classic
a pupil

Shil-
and oth
to hav
views
sit," N
ing til
anythi
proof
the g
Charle
fact th
meeting
being

Spee-
letter,
Simeon
past tw
have t
have n
day he
years h
ing he
All th
be tak
friend
world:
believ
tell yo
loss.
of sor
going
but th

As I
biograp
athlet
colleg
read s
drivin
He no
came
poetry
was n
try wa
lightf
himse
called
a nam
astica
in va
for hi

ble dislike to mathematics. This dislike, says a friend, "proved disastrous to his hopes of graduating with distinction, for the iron rule which compels all candidates for the Classical Tripos to take mathematical honours first, resulted in his being unable to secure the prize which was universally adjudged to him by those who knew his powers." He was confessedly the first classic of his year. At Cambridge he was a pupil of the renowned Richard Shilleto.

Shilleto, like Bishops Lee and Lightfoot, and other great Cambridge scholars, seemed to have the faculty of making his interviews with his pupils pleasant. "I could sit," Neale says, "with Shilleto from morning till night." It is impossible to conceive anything of the sort more delightful. A proof of the veneration in which he held the great Evangelical leader, the Rev. Charles Simeon, may be gathered from the fact that, at Cambridge, he attended his meetings long after his own principles were being developed in a directly Church line.

Speaking of Simeon's death, he says in a letter, "When I came in I heard that Mr. Simeon was gone. He died at two minutes past two, and I, as you may easily conceive, have thought of little else all day since. I have not yet heard any particulars. So the day he has been preparing for for fifty-six years has come at last. Oh, what a meeting he and Henry Martin must have had! All the pleasure of thinking of that would be taken away by that horrible thought that friends will not know each other in another world: I cannot think how any one can believe it. Poor Mr. Simeon; I cannot tell you how much I am grieved for his loss. I should think there was a great deal of sorrow to-night in Cambridge. I was going to say what a glorious night for him, but there is no night there."

As to Neale's Cambridge life, one of his biographers writes: "Riding, boating, athletic games had no charm for this young collegian. Books were his passion; he read at meals, he read walking, he read driving, and what he read he forgot not. He now and always read everything that came to hand, but took special delight in poetry, biography, and history. His life was not altogether sedentary. Long country walks with a book or a friend were delightful to him, and he had already thrown himself enthusiastically into the study since called ecclesiology, but which was then in a nameless and embryo state. The ecclesiastical buildings scattered over the country in various stages of neglect and decay had for him an irresistible fascination, and his

greatest delight lay in making expeditions to the neighbouring villages, and noting all the peculiarities of these old churches. And while he was thus unconsciously preparing to become a great ecclesiastical antiquarian, likewise he was beginning those other studies of patristic and mediæval literature in which also he was to rise to so great excellence."

His greatest work at Cambridge was in connection with the Cambridge Camden, afterwards called the Ecclesiological Society.

A writer in the *Saturday Review* of December 12, 1885,* says: "It was a bold enterprise on the part of two undergraduates of Trinity College, Cambridge—John Mason Neale, in his third year, and Benjamin Webb, a freshman—to undertake at the far-off date of 1839, to reconstruct the visible worship and church architecture of England. Confessedly their movement was an off-shoot of what was still literally Tractarianism at Oxford, for the Tracts were still continuing to come out; but they took up the revival at the point at which the Oxford leaders left it weakest. Their college tutor, Archdeacon Thorpe, welcomed the bold suggestion with good humoured encouragement; and a small knot of fellow-workmen was soon collected, including, amongst others, the present Bishop of Carlisle, the late Archdeacon Freeman, Professor F. A. Paley, Professor Venables, and Mr. Beresford Hope, while among the Seniors, Dr. Mill gave the aid of his great name; a society was formed, called—why, it might be difficult to say—"The Cambridge Camden Society." In this case, as in so many others, the start was three-quarters of the battle, and for a term of years covering two generations of undergraduate life, the Camden Society was a noteworthy element in Cambridge life, active, self-assured, and, it must be owned, not overburdened with deference for academic authority, and accordingly duly resented in turn by old-fashioned Dons.

How could it be otherwise, when, as a contemporary of Neale's at Trinity tells us:† "There was the attempt of certain Trinity men to shame the Fellows and Dons of colleges into something like a respectable attendance at the college chapels, attendance being rigidly enforced upon the undergraduates. This was attempted by publishing lists of attendance upon the part of the Dons, and actually by offering the prize of

* In an obituary notice of Mr. Beresford Hope.

† The Rev. Edward J. Boyce, *S. Margaret's Magazine*, No. 3, p. 134.

a handsome Bible to the one who attended most regularly. The prize was secured by a Fellow who afterwards became a Colonial Bishop; but it would have been given to a well-known Dean had it not been part of his every-day duty as Dean to be present at chapel. Some profanely called this effort 'A Society for promoting Christianity amongst the Dons.'

I have not space to pursue the fortunes of the Society, either under its original or new name, during the twenty-seven years of its existence, nor of the great work it accomplished. Those who are curious in such matters may find much to interest them, especially in the early volumes of the "*Ecclesiologist*." Mr. Mowbray's well-known "*Reformation and Deformation*" was not exaggerated.

The "*Ecclesiologist*" continued to be published until December 1868, the last number being the one hundred and fifty-third, it had reached its majority—exactly twenty-one years.

In the number for October 1866, occurs the following "In Memoriam":

"It is scarcely necessary to say in this place that Mr. Neale was one of the original founders of the Cambridge Camden Society, and one of the earliest and ablest and most constant contributors to the pages of the '*Ecclesiologist*.' He lived long enough to see the complete triumph of the great principles for which he had laboured so zealously. . . . He has left behind him the reputation of being one of the most learned theologians, one of the most erudite scholars, one of the best linguists, one of the sweetest hymnologists, or perhaps the foremost liturgist of his time."

I cannot pretend to pass any judgment on his poems, and I would not undertake the ungracious task of criticising them were I competent to do so. Some persons allege that his metres occasionally halt, and that he now and then introduced ill-adapted words and disjointed rhythms. But the influence of his hymns is indisputable, and they are valued wherever the English language is known. Many a sad soul has been cheered by his translation from the Greek, "Art thou weary? art thou sore distressed?" Many a mourner has been comforted by his rendering from the Latin, "Brief life is here our portion." Many a Christian has learnt to realise the Communion of Saints by his "Jerusalem the Golden," and had his faith and love kindled by his "Jesus the very thought is sweet," "O happy band of pilgrims," and many other hymns and translations too numerous to name. What

Dr. Dykes did for hymn tunes, Dr. Neale, as it seems to me, did for hymns. Nor do I feel competent to speak as it deserves of his greatest work, and with which his name will always be connected—the foundation of the Convent or Sisterhood of S. Margaret. Suffice it to say that in this and its daughter foundations has been realised the truth that in acts of self-sacrifice and self-devotion on the part of Christian women this prosaic nineteenth century is not behind any period of the Church's history. The religious life has been as thoroughly realised by these noble-hearted daughters of the Church of England as in any other part of the Church Catholic, and that in the most real and practical ways, such as the care of the sick, the charge of orphans, the education of girls, the preparation of vestments of grace and beauty, besides direct missionary work undertaken in our large centres of population.

His reputation as a Church historian and liturgist was known all over Europe, especially in Russia and Greece. The Emperor Nicholas recognised the value of his History of the Eastern Church by presenting him with a valuable manuscript endorsed with the imperial autograph. "His loss," says G. M., "is felt far beyond the bounds of the little English Church of which he was so faithful a member. I myself was in a Russian Church after his decease, I did not know the priest nor he me, but I went up before the *Liturgy* began, and told him of our loss, asking him to remember the departed in the prayers of the Office. He expressed the most lively sorrow at the news, and immediately complied with my request, first asking what was his Christian name, as by the baptismal name alone the Eastern Church makes memorial of the departed."*

Speaking of the hold Neale quietly gained over the hearts of those who saw much of him, the same old acquaintance says: "He was ever most kind and considerate towards the workmen employed on the new convent buildings, and was on the spot many times a day to watch their progress. After he was taken ill he went to see the building now and then in a hand-chair. As soon as he arrived on the spot several of them were ready to carry him chair and all round the works, that he might not be shaken by the rough paths. Very often they have with tears expressed their desire to see him about with them again. On the day of his funeral it was thought better that all but the bearers (who were purposely chosen from his

* He was only forty-nine when he died.

workmen
The Si
them th
ment.
keep av
and can
ing sig
And
his wid
around
of all
Greek,
the tidi
the Pa
bell tol
dignifi
munior
were su
more s
shortne
age of
words:

Ther
church
by the
the aw
Just.

From

THE
written
op of
Benha
ful lif
statess
of cha
these
dents
Behin
vout,
belove
his pr
nating
to aw
Aro
Decem
mann

* "A
Benham

workmen) should continue their work. The Sisters yielded to what appeared to them their better judgment on this arrangement. But, poor fellows, they could not keep away, they almost all gave up work and came to the funeral. It was a touching sight."

And another circumstance witnessed to his widespread influence, and that was that around the same grave were representatives of all branches of the Church Catholic, Greek, Roman, and Anglican. When, too, the tidings of his death were telegraphed to the Patriarch of Holy Russia, the same bell tolled for Dr. Neale which is used for dignified ecclesiastics of the Orthodox Communion. The following Sunday his hymns were sung in countless churches, and what more suitable considering the comparative shortness of his busy life, for he died at the age of forty-nine years, than the favourite words :

" Brief life is here our portion,
Brief sorrow, short-lived care ;
The life that knows no ending,
The tearless life is there.

" The morning shall awaken,
The shadows shall decay ;
And each true-hearted servant
Shall shine as doth the day."

There in his quiet grave in the beautiful churchyard of East Grinstead surmounted by the emblem of salvation, he sleeps till the awakening at the Resurrection of the Just.

ARCHBISHOP TAIT.

From *The Sunday at Home* (London), August, 1891.

THE memoir of the late Primate, jointly written by his son-in-law, the present Bishop of Rochester, and by the Rev. William Benham, is the story of a saintly and beautiful life, as well as of a great ecclesiastical statesman and leader. Of the latter aspect of character, nothing can be written in these pages, but there are personal incidents and features that call for remark. Behind the prelate there was the man ; devout, simple-minded, earnest, loving, and beloved. His biographers have dealt with his private life in a tender and discriminating manner, but they have told enough to awaken interest and admiration.*

Archibald Campbell Tait was born on December 22, 1811, at Harviestoun, Clackmannanshire, where his father owned prop-

erty, as well as in Edinburgh and elsewhere ; much of which was lost through subsequent reverses of fortune. Two years later he was deprived of a fond mother, who left behind her nine children. The younger ones were tended by a faithful nurse, Betty Morton, who afterwards accompanied Archibald to Edinburgh, when he entered the famous Academy, and then to Glasgow, when he became a student in the University. Her affection for him and his gratitude for her motherly care continued unabated, and the faithful old nurse died with her hand clasped in his, as the morning broke on the opening day of the year 1834. Her memory was cherished among the members of the family, and when, twenty-two years later, her favourite became Bishop of London, he and they asked what Betty would have said ?

The dispositions of the father and son were singularly unlike, but a remarkable friendship and mutual confidence subsisted between them. The father took a deep interest in his son's studies, both at school and in college, and maintained a close correspondence with him on matters affecting his personal character and academic life. A memorandum book was found in his library, on his death in May, 1832, containing elaborate notes of his ideas and plans respecting his youngest and favourite son, and expressing not only his unchanged pride and joy in him, but unabated confidence in his future greatness. Long afterwards, the then Bishop of London, writing to his own son, an undergraduate at Oxford, said : " This day, thirty-six years ago, my father died. I heard of it in my rooms at Balliol, the day after I had returned from the Easter vacation. I was then twenty. I shall never forget how he used to write to me while I was in Glasgow, and how, though forty-eight years older than me, he was as much my companion as if he had been my brother."

Such confidence and pride were well-merited. As a student, he was diligent and painstaking. He reaped the reward in various honours and prizes, culminating in the Snell scholarship, which entitled him to a further course of education at Balliol College, Oxford. There he worked hard and successfully, winning a Fellowship in November, 1834, before he had completed his twenty-third year. Within twelve months he was appointed tutor of his college, and on Trinity Sunday, 1836, was ordained deacon by Bishop Bagot, of Oxford. He undertook, as a voluntary service, the charge of a vacant curacy at Marsh Baldon,

* " Archbishop Tait," by Randall T. Davidson and William Benham. *Macmillan*.

a neglected district five miles from Balliol, where he continued to labour for five years, notwithstanding the onerous duties of his Fellowship and Tutorship, and the other public work devolving upon him in the University during the troublous and stormy times of the Newmanite controversies.

A new career was opened by his appointment to succeed Dr. Thomas Arnold, as head master of Rugby, in July, 1842. The spirit in which he entered upon his duties finds expression in an entry in his diary: "Let me view this event, not as success, but as the opening up of a fresh field of labour in Thy vineyard. Give me a holy heart. Give me boldness and firmness in Thy service. Give me unflinching perseverance. Banish all indolence. Give me freedom from worldly ambition. O Lord! I have much labour before me, much to do of a secular character. Grant that this may never draw me from regular habits of devotion, without which the Christian life cannot be preserved in me." In this frame of mind he carried on his great work at Rugby, with credit to himself and to the advantage of the school, until stricken down in 1848 by rheumatic fever, which left him so enfeebled and shaken that in the following year he accepted the Deanery of Carlisle, as an agreeable and necessary change.

In the early Rugby days he had married Catherine, youngest daughter of Archdeacon Spooner, who for five-and-thirty years was a devoted partner and helpmeet. The touching story is told by the Archbishop himself in the memoir of his wife and their beloved son, Craufurd, both of whom were taken away in 1878; the latter, at the age of twenty-nine, just as he was entering on a ministerial course that promised great usefulness. The parents were called upon during their married life to endure heavy trials in the loss of children. The mother's hand has given to the world a sacred record which will live in English literature, and which is already known and revered in every land. Scarlet fever in a virulent form broke out in Carlisle early in 1856, and within the short space of four weeks the Dean and his wife were bereft of five little children. The marks of this great sorrow were never wholly eradicated. In his private diary, and in his intimate correspondence, Tait frequently refers to it, especially at the recurrence of the anniversaries. That it exerted a hallowing influence upon his own character is manifest from the way in which he acquitted himself under circumstances of severe trial in his high positions, when his conduct was misunderstood

and his motives were impugned; and from the tender sympathy which he was always ready to manifest towards bereaved and mourning friends.

One specimen of the latter may be quoted. It was written in 1867:—"I almost fear that before this reaches you, your beloved boy will have left you. How bitter the trial to parents none can know but those who have gone through it, and if it please God thus to visit you, long indeed will it be before any brightness can return to life. I trust it may yet please God to preserve him to you, and make him grow up to be a blessing to many. But if he is taken, the thought of the sorrows and trials he escapes will gradually comfort you, and there is certainly something that raises and cheers in the assured belief that our children are already with Christ, ready to welcome us when, through His mercy, we ourselves shall be admitted to the same glorious presence. The death of a child, and of such a child, has in it an inexpressible sweetness, when we can forget the suffering and all the harrowing details, in the one thought that he is with Jesus. We ourselves are able to think calmly what a far better lot has been given to our beloved Catty and May, than if now, in the twenty-first and twentieth years of their early womanhood, they had been beginning the real difficulties of life here among us; though God knows how sweet was the companionship which they gave promise of affording us, had they been allowed to stay with us till now."

The maturing and ripening of Christian character can be easily traced throughout the memoir. When recovery from his illness at Rugby seemed hopeless, he took solemn leave of his family and friends, and sent special messages to others. One of these, to Principal Shairp, was thus expressed:—"Tell him I have perfect peace from faith in the simplest of all truths, that Christ died for the ungodly." When entering upon the responsible duties of the Bishopric of London, in October, 1856, he wrote in his diary: "Let me dedicate myself afresh, O Lord, to Thee. In this new sphere give me more than ever the spirit of prayer, of holy meditation, of holy zeal, of right judgment, of Christian boldness, and of Christian meekness. Grant that the insidious temptations of the trappings of worldly greatness may not impede my heavenward course. I feel the danger. Raise my soul heavenwards, through Jesus Christ our Lord." Twenty-one years later, the same secret record has this entry, on

Good F
derfully
years!
lees. L
vice. V
I went
petty ca
my last
disputes
have eve
ual life
copate.

Utter
Of their
Special
and de
that Bis
and stil
his prin
strain o
insepara
by meth
keep pa
and att
were al
but, in
liament
of the
nected
sponder
not be
bishop,
from t
which
the Ep
in Am
help;
more l
had to

Ami
Archbi
of his
or soo
citeme
for the
for a
fully w
the fa
busiest
occupi
home
Sunda
Addin
to thi
day, a
church
I felt
near."
—"O
since
went

Good Friday, 1877 :—"O Lord, how wonderfully hast Thou dealt with me in past years! I trust I am not settled on my lees. Lord, keep me ever fresh in Thy service. What a whirl was I plunged in when I went to London! Keep me from the petty cares of party warfare. Darken not my last years with these frivolous and bitter disputes which rend the Church. They have ever been endeavouring to mar spiritual life during the twenty years of my episcopate. Lord, keep my faith and zeal fresh."

Utterances such as these are frequent. Of their sincerity there can be no doubt. Special need existed for vigilance, humility, and devotion. During the twelve years that Bishop Tait filled the See of London, and still more during the fourteen years of his primacy, he was exposed to an incessant strain of work and to not a few temptations inseparable from his high position. Only by methodical and ceaseless labour could he keep pace with the demands upon his time and attention. The claims of his diocese were alone sufficient to absorb his energies, but, in addition, there were duties in Parliament and in Convocation, the interests of the great societies and institutions connected with the Church, an immense correspondence, and social obligations that could not be avoided. When he became Archbishop, responsibilities were superadded from the peculiar and anxious times in which he lived, and from the way in which the Episcopal Churches in the Colonies and in America looked to him for counsel and help; while his public appearances became more frequent and his public utterances had to be carefully weighed.

Amidst all these grave responsibilities the Archbishop maintained the intense warmth of his home affections. Nothing delighted or soothed him more than to leave the excitement and ceremonial of Lambeth Palace for the comparative quiet of Addington, or for a brief Continental tour. He enjoyed fully what he loved to call "the bosom of the family." The private diaries of his busiest and most anxious years are largely occupied with brief entries respecting his home and family life. He writes on Easter Sunday, 1879 :—"A week of quiet rest at Addington. The solemnity of the return to this dear place is great indeed. To-day, at the Holy Communion in the lovely church, adorned with all its Easter beauties, I felt the presence of the beloved ones very near." Again he writes, when at Lambeth :—"Our wedding day. Thirty-seven years since that bright summer morning when we went together to the dear little church at

Elmdon. I have been alone in the chapel here, thinking it all over after the day's work was done. Amid blessings and trials how does life pass! Blessed Saviour, stand by me to the end. Blessed Father, into Thy hands I give myself and all I love."

His home life was uniformly simple and beautiful. "Given to hospitality," and from the exigencies of his position compelled to entertain much company, he yet found sweet and special solace in the inner circle of those dearest to him. He loved to listen to the reading of books of general literature, interspersing shrewd comments, and taking a foremost part in kindly criticism. One who knew him well, and who has an exceptional right to speak, says, "To see how a man, as ceaselessly occupied as he was with public affairs, was yet able to combine with these the very tenderest relations—free, and happy, and unreserved—towards his own family, gave one an ideal, practically realised, of what family life should be." The Bishop of Rochester truly says in the memoir :—"The strain of monotonous work, and the tension of difficult situations, may oftentimes be lightened and relaxed by one who has a keen, and withal a good-natured eye for the humorous side of even the gravest facts of life. It is, perhaps, a rare quality in ecclesiastics, and in most men it is not without its peril. In the Archbishop it was accompanied by an earnestness so intense, and a sympathy so tender, that I do not believe he ever, in this particular way, gave a moment's pain to any one."

Yet he could administer a deserved rebuke in a dignified manner. A worthy man, for example, wrote to him at some length, asking him to consider the question whether, "since the Ascension of our Blessed Lord into heaven, it was not right that the Lord's Prayer should be used with a clause as to His mediatorial work appended, as is the rule in other Christian prayers." The reply, by the hand of a chaplain, was as follows :—"I am directed by the Archbishop to say that it does not appear to him to be necessary that you should undertake to make any additions to the Lord's Prayer." He honestly valued criticism, and used to say that if he had been cured of certain early habits of awkwardness in public speaking, it was entirely due to seeing himself "wholesomely caricatured." An instance is recorded of his sending for the ponderous book in which newspaper extracts were pasted, in order to show to his tailor a cartoon of himself from "Punch," with the remark :—"I want you particu-

larly to notice how the British public regards your gaiters."

He usually wrote his sermons with the utmost care, and would correct and alter them for subsequent delivery, often when driving to the church. Once being so engaged, he heard a loud noise, and saw a runaway horse with a heavy dray making for his carriage. He stood up, sermon in hand, and as the horse approached he threw the sermon in its face. The animal was so bewildered by the fluttering of the leaves that it swerved and paused; the driver regained control; the sermon was recovered; and the prelate went on his way. Describing the incident on his return, he said, "I don't know whether my sermon did any good to the congregation to-day, but it was of considerable service to myself;" adding, "I don't suppose the poor beast ever had such a 'blatter' of theology before."

Under date of May 8, 1881, he records a dinner at the Mansion House, given by the Lord Mayor to Dr. Moffat, the African Missionary, whose speech, says the Archbishop, "was very interesting, but he seemed likely to continue the reminiscences of his fifty years' work in Africa long beyond midnight, had not his octogenarian neighbour, Lord Shaftesbury, more accustomed to measure the endurance of assemblies than the solitary missionary, pulled him down by the coat-tails after he had spoken half-an-hour."

In dealing with his vast and varied correspondence the Archbishop had the assistance of his chaplains, but he was scrupulous in having replies sent even to the many letters that curiosity or indolence inflict upon exalted personages on matters with which they have no concern. As years advanced, he grew less and less inclined to read letters himself or to write the answers; but, with a few necessary exceptions, each letter was read to him and he indicated a reply, if this was not fully dictated. His favourite mode was to do this while walking about the room or in the garden. Often he would keep back a letter to "simmer" for a day, so that he might reconsider his intended reply. This arose from his constant anxiety to do nothing that might appear harsh or unkind. Even when some bore had to be replied to, or some preposterous request refused, he would only say, "Tell him he is a consummate ass, but do it very kindly."

Pathetic entries frequently occur, after another prolonged illness in 1869-70, of his feeling tired and weary. But he kept at work until the last. Even though laid

aside from active effort for some time before his death, he never ceased to take a deep interest in the affairs both of the Church and of the nation. From his sick-room at Addington a holy influence emanated, and one of the last acts of his life, though one not universally approved, was to intervene as a peacemaker in a matter that had long agitated and disturbed the Church. His son-in-law writes:—"As the acuter stage of his illness came to an end, the look of pain and weariness passed quite away, and for many weeks he was full of keen and vigorous interest in all that was going on, and enlivened the business of each day with the same quiet humour as of old. He had no wish, I think, for recovery, and what he dreaded above all things was that his life should be prolonged as a helpless invalid. For his more strictly devotional hours, the privilege of daily ministering to him in those long weeks of illness is one that cannot be forgotten by those on whom the duty lay. Never did the manly courage of his Christian faith assert itself with more unaffected courage and simplicity than in the 'quietness and confidence' of the daily prayers in that sick room. To be with him at such an hour was to receive in very truth 'the peace of God which passeth all understanding.'"

Thus, gradually and peacefully, he drew near the end. Intimate friends came to take a solemn leave of him, and were sent away with a benediction. Faithful servants were not forgotten. He dictated and tried to write a farewell message to the Queen, in response to a special inquiry:—"A last memorial of twenty-six years of devoted service; with earnest love and affectionate blessing on the Queen and her family." Loved ones around his bedside joined with him in the Holy Communion, uttered familiar hymns and Scripture passages, and at his own request, offered the commendatory prayer from Bishop Andrewes. On Advent Sunday morning, 1882, he tranquilly breathed his last. His youngest daughter, who has since joined him, wrote in her diary:—"It was a quiet, happy time, in spite of the anxiety and need of patience both for him and us. We always feel as if we had spent that time like the pilgrims in the land of Beulah, waiting for the messenger and the crossing of the river; and he was like Mr. Standfast, for the day he was to cross, 'there was a great calm at that time in the river,' and it was so quiet and so shallow that 'when he was about half-way in, he stood a while, and talked to his companions that had waited upon him hither.'"

From 2

WE
the doc
his bro
selves a
the act
and, on
Society
that ou
be has
time be
can pro
the mo
next, v
ion wil
memb
sequen
brief t
ment o
and p
We do
and hi
and ea
they h
a crisis
ing so
except
phrase
Societ
we are
act in
tempe
need h
The
bishop
first,
presid
second
partic
third
fourth
prosel
and,
confir
Churc
the
verdic
these
shoul
"giv
Bisho
ence,
stitut
chair
time
recon
mone
not l
bisho

PALESTINE TROUBLES.

From *The Rock* (Ch. Eng.), London, September 4, 1891.

WE have received, just as we go to press, the document in which the Archbishop and his brother Bishops have expressed themselves about the troubles in Palestine, and the action on the one hand of Bishop Blyth, and, on the other, of the Church Missionary Society and its missionaries. It is manifest that our comments upon it this week must be hastily penned. It must also be some time before the Church Missionary Society can pronounce upon it, for though there is the monthly General Committee on Tuesday next, when probably the Archbishop's opinion will be mentioned, the majority of the members will be away on holiday, and consequently we cannot expect more than a brief talk over the matter with an adjournment of the discussion for more deliberate and prayerful judgment at a later date. We do, however, congratulate His Grace and his assessors upon the Christian caution and earnest spirit manifested in that which they have written, and we must in so grave a crisis thank the Father of spirits for having so guided them. We doubt if there is, except in one paragraph, more than a phrase or two here and there which the Society need hesitate to accept frankly, and we are sure that if Bishop Blyth will but act in future according to the tone and temper of the counsel here offered, there need be no further difficulties.

The five points upon which the Archbishop and Bishops have conferred are—first, the Bishop's presence at, and desire to preside over, the Missionary Conference; secondly, the relations of the clergy, and particularly the native clergy to the Bishop; thirdly, the work amongst Mohammedans; fourthly, the charge against the Society of proselytising from the Eastern Churches; and, lastly, the refusal by the Bishop of confirmation where a person joining our Church had already in his own Church had the rite of Chrism. Substantially, the verdict is in favour of the Society on all these heads, although the Society is, as we should expect from Bishops, advised to "give the utmost consideration to the Bishop's suggestions." As to the Conference, it is admitted that it is a body constituted altogether by the Society, with a chairman not permanent, but elected each time the Conference meets. It is, however, recommended that the Bishop be not summoned to it, seeing that if he comes he may not be asked to preside. Yet the Archbishop of Canterbury himself attends the

Society's annual meeting in Exeter Hall without thinking of presiding, and without the least forfeiture of dignity or consideration on that account. Bishop Blyth is counselled to have a Synod of all his clergy, officially summoned by himself. Our one objection to this would be that it excludes the laity, but that is a Church question within the Bishop's competence as matters stand in Dioceses, whether at home or abroad. It has no direct concern with a Missionary Society. The Bishops say that, during the interregnum, when there was no Bishop in Palestine, the Missionary Conference, not without necessity, "discussed matters which are not properly within its scope." What is intended probably is not that a private Conference had not manhood's right to discuss whatever it wished, but that the result of these discussions became public, and that action was taken upon resolutions of Conference. In the issue, probably, the Bishop will do as Bishops elsewhere are content to do; he will have his own diocesan organisation, a part of which the C.M.S. ordained agents must necessarily become. Whatever troubles arise in other dioceses are adjusted by common sense and Christian charity. Why should not the same be in Palestine?

As to clergy and their licenses, nothing could be wiser than the remark that mutual consideration "should obviate any need of rules." Where suspension of a native clergyman by his European Superintendent may be unhappily a necessity, this is not to involve loss of salary until his case has been fully adjudicated upon. Here there had been, on the part of a Superintending Missionary, a slight misunderstanding of the rule, for which due apology was made, and there will be no future difficulty. The suspension was perfectly right, but the salary should have been continued to the native Curate. The Bishop is desired, where he licenses clergy for work amongst Jews in areas already occupied by C.M.S. missionaries, to define and limit such licenses. This, if agreed to by Bishop Blyth, will settle a case about which there has been some not unnatural sensitiveness.

As to missions to Mohammedans, those who know the Archbishop's pet theories will appreciate the intention of the observation that "Some diversities in practice are not only unavoidable but are even desirable." The fiercest onslaught upon the Society was in the charge about Proselytism, and we are glad to learn that Bishop Blyth "has now declared himself thankful that the Society thus distinctly repudiates the

employment of agents for aggressive purposes; and the Bishop thinks that personal explanation has "smoothed the difficulties of the present situation." It is a polite way of returning the verdict "not proven," but we fear that here on neither side has the last word been said. We, however, will leave our readers to read the paragraph, and we will not propose further comment this week on a most intricate and delicate portion of the situation. On the question of refusing Confirmation, which Bishop Blyth had determinedly done, the award is that "laying-on of hands ought not to be refused," where there is the true and conscientious desire for it on the part of the candidate.

In the concluding paragraphs a pregnant hint is given that the Church of England has as much right in Palestine as other churches. This has been overlooked by many of the hottest of the controversialists. We are no more intruders there than the Greek Church; we have only been later in going there. The Latin Church, which many of our Ritualistic friends admire, has had no scruples about pushing itself into the country. In the last sentences there is a hope of more amicable relations, which we most heartily respond to. We have bated the incisiveness of our remarks, because we are most anxious that there should be peace, if possible. So infinite are the human interests involved, so supreme is the duty of preaching the truth as it is in Jesus upon the soil hallowed by His own footsteps, that we ought to suffer but one motive to actuate us, namely, love of Him and love of those for whom He died. We ought solely to be guided by the one principle, what would He do were He treading that sacred land to-day? If we are sure that He would faithfully rebuke man, so must we. If we have no doubt whatever that He would not spare corruptions, neither must we. If we believe that in doing this He would use gentle words and persuasive means, so must we. Our severity must always be less than His, because we do not possess His knowledge of the truth, and His insight into human character. Our lovingness of heart can never equal His, for He was the Love itself.

LAY MINISTRATIONS IN CHURCH.

From *The Guardian* (Ch. Eng.), London, August 19, 1891.

ALL the world knows that the Bishop of London is a very bold man. Every year brings some fresh proof of his courage, and

one, not the least striking, was given on the 21st of March last, when, by an act of single-handed authority, he enriched the Church of England with a new order of ministers. On that day, in the presence of a great congregation in St. Paul's Cathedral, with prayer and exhortation and symbolical acts, he appointed certain laymen to preach and conduct divine service in consecrated buildings. It is true that this startling commission is hedged by certain conditions: it is revocable by the Bishop, it can only be exercised where and when the incumbent wishes it, and it applies, not to the sacraments, and not to the obligatory matins and evensong, but only to "extra services." But, even making allowance for these limitations, it is certainly a grave innovation. What is most surprising is that it passed at the time and since with so little observation. But now that the new order of ministers has been for nearly six months at work, and that it has extended to at least one diocese outside London, it seems high time for Churchmen to bestow some attention on an experiment "charged," as Mr. Harry Jones says, "with seminal possibilities" of the highest moment. We shall not now argue the theoretical permissibility of laymen's ministrations, from the point of view of the constitution and order of the Catholic Church. The organic relation between the ordained priesthood and the whole "spirit-bearing body" of baptised Christians was drawn out by a master-hand in Bishop Moberly's Bampton Lectures. The first principles of the matter seem plain enough. Only two functions are the exclusive prerogative of the priesthood, in such a sense that no one not in priest's orders can possibly perform them. Only a priest can consecrate the Eucharist or absolve the penitent, but every other religious rite, including that of Baptism, can, and under fitting circumstances may, be administered by laymen. If this be so, the question before us becomes one of practice rather than of theory. Granting that laymen can, under certain circumstances, preach and conduct religious services, is it expedient that they should do so, by episcopal authority, in the consecrated buildings of the Church of England at the present day?

An important question is whether such ministrations are legal. As members of a Church claiming to be Apostolic, we are bound to look first at their ecclesiastical propriety. But even granting that we are satisfied on that head, the legal consideration arises. The Church of England, as long as she is established, is also an institu-

tion of aspect the ne law? consti by th the m some of the by the to be overl was c on sp cal, an unless the C and in seem or co legal in, he ished conte all t such it, is op, f pensi move Bisho They man bent the M not cann serve consi prac lishe chur culia expe licen doct repu cong op's that exp esse own W cult We mer late of t par men

tion of the realm, governed, as regards that aspect of her position, by statute-law. Are the new ministrations compatible with that law? The new order was not hurriedly constituted. A committee, presided over by the Bishop of Marlborough, examined the matter in all its bearings, and spent some two years over the task. The report of the committee was carefully considered by the Bishop and his suffragans. It is not to be supposed that the legal question was overlooked; but it is conceivable that it was overshadowed, in devout minds bent on spiritual work, by religious, ecclesiastical, and practical considerations. Certainly, unless the law affecting divine worship in the Church of England has been generally and immemorably misinterpreted, it would seem that an unordained person preaching or conducting service in church commits a legal offence, for which, if it were persisted in, he could be proceeded against and punished. The advocates of the new system contend that the Bishop's permission makes all the difference. To officiate without such permission is illegal: to officiate with it, is legal. But is this so? Has the Bishop, from the legal point of view, this dispensing power? Some critics of the new movement doubt it. They deny that the Bishop's fiat or veto can affect the case. They contend that, if it is lawful for a layman to officiate in church where the incumbent allows it, it is equally lawful whether the Bishop approves or not. His fiat cannot make it more than lawful. His veto cannot make it less. This, it will be observed, is not a mere question of legal and constitutional theory. It has a directly practical bearing. Should it once be established that laymen may lawfully officiate in church, an incumbent of advanced or peculiar views might feel tempted to try the experiment of dispensing with the Bishop's license, and might ask a layman, whose doctrine he knows that the Diocesan would repudiate, to preach in his pulpit. If the congregation, aggrieved, sought the Bishop's help against the intruder, we suspect that his lordship would find it difficult to expel him from the pulpit except by processes which would eventually silence his own nominees.

We turn now from the hypothetical difficulties to the actual aspects of the case. We understand that these "dedicated laymen," as the Bishop of London calls them, lately met in council under the presidency of the Bishop of Marlborough, and compared notes as to the working of the experiment so far, and as to its possible exten-

sions. They reported that their ministrations had been very freely used by the incumbents to whom they were allotted, and they gave interesting details of the amount of work done, especially in the way of Mission services after evensong and children's services. It was unanimously decided that it would be undesirable, at present, for the lay preachers to preach at the morning service on Sunday. It was held that, whenever they officiated, it was more discreet to speak of them as "delivering addresses" than as "preaching sermons." It was agreed that their discourses should rather deal with plain religious and moral duties than with theological doctrine. It was agreed that there was much scope for further developments of their ministerial work—in holding special services at sacred seasons and for special objects; even conducting the Three Hours' devotion on Good Friday. Finally, it was urged by the lay preachers, High Churchmen and Low alike, that they should be allowed to administer the chalice at the Holy Communion.

Now it is obvious that the line of action thus sketched out would have practical conveniences. In parishes where the incumbent is single-handed, or even where he has one or two curates, the immense and increasing number and variety of public ministrations exacted from him exhaust his strength, and leave him really no leisure for meditation or study. To a priest so circumstanced it would be an immense boon if he could, consistently both with ecclesiastical order and with secular law, hand over some of his extra and special services and discourses to a devout and competently instructed layman, working without fee and reward. Even the startling proposal that a layman should administer the chalice touches a physical burden, which, in these days of early and frequent celebrations, is very real and very trying. To this particular innovation we are altogether opposed. It would lead almost inevitably to misunderstanding of Eucharistic doctrine, and in churches where that doctrine is denied or obscured, to great practical irreverence. But in no other department of the work contemplated by the new order could this particular danger arise.

The quite different danger, referred to above, of bringing teachers of strange doctrines into our pulpits, though we conceive that it is a real one, of course does not arise if the Bishop is rightly informed as to the legal efficacy and indispensability of his license. The mischief which chiefly threatens lies in another direction. Nothing is

more important than that unlearned members of the Church (and learned ones, too, for that matter) should apprehend clearly, and bear steadily in mind, first, the awful and essential distinction which separates the Eucharistic mysteries from every other part, however edifying, of the Church's public service; and then, strictly in connection with this truth, the indelible difference between those who bear and those who do not bear the august commission of the priesthood. If the experiment which the Bishop of London has inaugurated, with its unaccustomed spectacle of "dedicated laymen" preaching and ministering in consecrated places, tends to obscure these vital distinctions, it may be followed by lamentable and even fatal consequences. If, on the other hand, it serves to make more clear the line which separates the service of the altar from the offices of the choir, and the celebrant of the one from the minister of the others, it may promote the intelligent appreciation of a central truth, while it gives valuable help to the working of the Church in places where the harvest is plenteous but the labourers are all too few.

JESUIT METHODS IN FOREIGN MISSION WORK.

BY W. ROBINSON, SALEM, SOUTH INDIA.

From *The Independent* (Non-Conformist), London, August 14 and 21, 1891.

I.—ANCIENT.

It is quite time that attention was drawn to this subject, and that, once for all, English people should know what Jesuit methods in foreign missionary work were and are. Protestant missionaries are told by Mr. Caine that they are failures, and that the right way to obtain success is to follow the example of a Jesuit priest, who dresses himself as a Hindu Fakir, who goes through the bazaars with his holy beads and a mendicant's bowl, begging a dole of rice and at the same time preaching the Gospel. This is an effective picture drawn by no unskilful hand, and the only objection against it is the fatal one—that it is untrue to the facts of history and directly contrary to Jesuit methods of work. As a mis-statement it is so stupendous that a man requires to live in India to get its true perspective. Its absurdity is so "gross, open and palpable" that it is difficult to suppose the statement is made seriously. If it is seriously meant,

then it is a fashion of making history that Jules Verne or the writer of "Baron Munchausen" might envy.

India is a bookless country, and I am now writing under the disadvantage of not being able to use any material except the scrappy information scattered through the few books of a missionary's library. The Jesuits must have the credit of beginning what may be called the middle period of mission work in India. Macaulay tells us that less than a hundred years ago "the spiritual force of Protestantism was a mere local militia," confined to England and some of her colonies. The Church of Rome was *par excellence* the missionary Church, and had sent forth the best and bravest of her sons to bring Asia to the authority of the Church.

In 1540 St. François Xavier, Apostle of India, came from Portugal to Goa, and made innumerable converts in the ten years he spent in this land. His method of work he thus describes: "I have begun to go through all the villages of this coast, with bell in hand, collecting together a large concourse of both men and boys. Bringing them twice a day into a convenient place, I give them Christian instruction. The boys, in the space of a month, have committed all to memory beautifully. Then I told them to teach what they had learned to their parents, household and neighbours. On Sundays they came together—men, boys, girls and women—into a sacred edifice, with an ardent desire to hear. I began with the confession of the Holy Trinity, the Lord's Prayer, the Angelic Salutation, the Apostles' Creed, pronouncing them in their own language in a clear voice. All followed me in the repetition, in which they take uncommon pleasure. Then I went through the Creed alone, pausing upon each Article, asking whether they believed without any doubt. All, in an equally confident tone, with their hands in the form of a cross on their breast, affirmed that they truly believed it." This is Xavier's own account, but there is a tradition on the Coromandel coast that the great missionary simply collected the people together by ringing a bell, and there and then, pronouncing the words of Absolution, sprinkled them with holy water by means of a brush. In this way he baptized a crowd of people in a few minutes. Without attaching over-much importance to this tradition, let us remember that Xavier was the accredited agent of the King of Portugal, and that to him doubtless the same instructions were given as were given to Cabral, commander

of the second expedition to India A.D. 1500. Marshman says: "He (Cabral) was accompanied by eight friars, and directed to carry fire and sword into every province which would not receive their teaching." Instead of begging his way, carrying a mendicant's bowl and wearing his garb, Xavier's progress was that of a triumphant conqueror, and throughout the whole Peninsula the people regarded him not only as a religious teacher, but also as a political deliverer, who would safeguard their temporal interests. In this double aspect of his work it is not difficult to account for his success, and we may well accord to him the splendid distinction which his French biographer claims—"Apostle of India."

After Xavier came the Jesuit Fathers, and although they are in the succession of his work they dropped his methods entirely. In 1606 the celebrated Robert de Nobili, a relative of Pope Julian the Third and of the Cardinal Bellarmine, arrived in India and entered on a career of preaching which lasted forty years. His energy and self-denial were almost superhuman, his methods were Satanic in their subtlety. He was profoundly learned in the languages and customs of the country. He became all things to all men to a degree that makes one shudder. He became a master of the high and low dialects of the Tamil language, and, disguising himself as a Brahmin, suddenly appeared before the Brahmins of Madura, reputed to be the most learned of their class, and *swore on oath* that, like them, he was descended from Brahma, and had received from him a Divine revelation, which he called the Fourth Veda. The Madura Brahmins were not at first to be taken in, but Nobili's persistence overcame their prejudice. From the beginning he and his brother Jesuits solemnly swore that they were not Europeans, but that they were real Brahmins. They dressed in native costume, they wore the sacred thread, and smeared themselves with holy ashes; they took part in Brahminic ceremonies, repeated prayers to Hindu gods, but substituted the name of the Virgin or of some saint whenever it was possible to do so. They observed caste in all its inhuman exclusiveness. These things, however, did not attract the Brahmins. Nobili's converts were of the Sudra and Pariah class. These were allowed the widest latitude in their profession, and the Christian Sudra joined his Hindu brother in all heathen rites and ceremonies as heretofore. He observed the same rules as to food, bathing and the ordinary intercourse of life. The

so-called Christian had his cars and idolatrous processions, as though he were still Hindu. Nobili was a warrior by nature, and he set himself resolutely to conquer or die in planting the Cross in India; at times he had to endure terrible hardships, but again we read that some of the Tributary Rajahs to the King of Madura received the great "Sanyasi" with all distinction.

This unblushing system of deceit went on for 150 years. All distinctions between Christianity and Hinduism were obliterated. It is remarkable to note the way in which lists of the baptized were worked up. This is in more senses than one a true Jesuit method. Thousands of dying children were baptized surreptitiously; Jesuit Catechists, having a knowledge of medicine, were called into native houses, and whilst giving medicine to the sick, the Catechists made over them the sign of the Cross, and counted them as converts to the true faith.

A letter from the missionary Grundler, dated Tranquebar, January 6, 1710, shows how this system of deceit was practised at that time. In 1709 there were no converts, so the Portuguese Church *bought a number of slaves*, at prices varying from eight to sixteen shillings each. When eighty slaves were collected, a public day was fixed, the slaves were marched to church, and there were publicly baptized; not one question was asked at the ceremony. The slaves, now made Christian, were marched in procession through the streets of Tranquebar; small copper coins were scattered among the people. This took place in the territory of the Protestant King of Denmark. Grundler found, on subsequent inquiry, that these Jesuit-made Christians did not even know the Lord's Prayer. Still more surprising is the account of an interview between the Tranquebar missionaries and a Brahmin. The Brahmin had called upon them, and was wearing his sacred thread; he had also the distinguishing marks of his caste and all the outward badges of heathenism. To the surprise of the missionaries, the Brahmin declared himself to be a Roman Catholic, and confessed that all he knew of Christianity was that he had been sprinkled with water.

Another letter, written from Madras, in 1713, by the Rev. G. Lewis, throws a strong light upon the character of the non-caste Roman Catholics. He says: "For a little rice they will be of any religion, and for as small a consideration leave it again; and it is out of these that the Romish priests chiefly make their proselytes, whereby it

comes to pass that the Christians in these countries are the scoundrel part of mankind; there is hardly a viler generation in the world, and a man had better have to do with an infidel, heathen, Turk, or anything than with them." In the book from which these extracts are made, "The Account of Ziegenbalg and Plutschan's Mission to Tranquebar," published in 1718, is a letter by a sea captain who had taken several Jesuits out to China, in which he urges the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge *not* to send any Portuguese Scriptures to China, because the copies would be collected by the Romish missionaries and burned. He related how Padre Tonglong, Prior of the Jesuits in China, assisted at a sacrifice to Confucius, and dipped his finger in the hog's blood that was sprinkled on the altar. When taxed about it, the Padre "answered like a Jesuit that though he assisted like a China Mandarin, he said the prayers of a Christian all the time of the ceremony."

This horrible system of deception and compromise worked its own destruction. In time of persecution the baptized heathen simply declared he was a heathen, and defied any one to prove the contrary. In the Tanjore persecutions of 1701 thousands of so-called Christians at once apostatized and saved their lives at the expense of their faith. And in the Mysore persecutions, when Tipu Sultan exported 30,000 Catholics, and compelled them to be circumcised and become Mohammedans, the Abbé Dubois makes the heart-breaking confession that out of 60,000 Catholics in the Mysore Province, not one had the courage to die for his religion. It was probably this painful experience that led this grand old missionary, in his later years, to declare that it was impossible for any Hindu ever to become a Christian.

It is to the credit of Pope Gregory that, when these converts numbered three millions, he discovered how vile and worthless they were. Following this discovery came the suppression of the Company of Jesuits as a mission agency in India. This is still regarded as an irreparable calamity. The fathers refused obedience to the papal decrees. Pope Clement called them "obstinate and impudent," and it was proved in 1734 that while the fathers in India vowed and swore on the Holy Gospels that they would obey the papal order, they yet perjured themselves by persisting in their former practices.

Père Thirion, writing on these Jesuit methods, says: "To understand the con-

cessions made by the missionaries of former times to caste usages, reference is necessary to the different circumstances of time and place which rendered them legitimate. . . . If it was permissible to a philosopher to say, 'Perish the world for an idea,' still stronger reasons existed to justify the Pope and the missionaries in saying the same for the scrupulous maintenance of the ascertained faith of God." The ascertained faith of God was exchanged for a lie, and the pure practice of Christianity was subordinated to the hideous travesties of heathenism, and one feels that the summing up of the whole matter by that prince of missionary critics, Dr. Mullens, is true. "Of all misrepresentations of missionary labour theirs was the most awful; of all deliberate rejection of the Gospel, for heathen rules in preference, theirs was the most voluntary; of all the lying and perjury which have been committed by men of knowledge and education, theirs were the most deliberate, most unblushing, most continued, that the world ever saw. Such was, in deed and truth, the system of the famous Madura mission, a mission full of scandalous wickedness from its beginning to its end."

These are the gods of the modern missionary critic, and to their pattern every Protestant missionary must conform. To do otherwise were to commit the gravest sin. In 1675, at Dharm Apuri, in the Salem District, were two European priests. One was assigned exclusively to minister to the higher castes, and was called the "Priest of the Brahmins," while the other, called "Pandarani Swami, ministered to the pariahs of the neighbourhood." This was done, according to the naive confession of the writer, "*so that caste prejudices might not stay the progress of conversions.*" Could the horrible system of compromise go further than it has in this stupendous hypocrisy? I well know that the critic, in his flippant, airy manner, will say in reply, "I only want you, the Protestant missionary, to imitate that which was good in the Jesuit, and to avoid his evil practices." I answer, show me the good and I will pursue it. I suspect it will take the critic all his time to do this, and even then, if he is an honest man, he will admit that the task is too much for him, and if your readers bring a candid mind to the consideration of the facts I have quoted—every one of which is capable of the fullest historical proof—then they will read another meaning into the much vaunted, but little understood, superiority of Jesuit methods.

Political
work of
In 1751
Jesus wi
erty, and
did the s
its unsp
XIV., in
whole so
Indian J
resources
guished.
vaunted
the co-
ing the
Goa cler
churches
property
Archbish
churches
This has
most co
XVI. al
oprics i
priests
Apostoli
scribed
Catholic
This we
was hea
submit
Archbis
For s
the Jesu
lowed t
1830 a
estant m
thorities
was urg
and in
menced
at work
sionarie
kindled
marche
ing hea
exposed
in the
and the
beasts.
curry a
result
by exp
than t
died.
Mass,
An En
at this
proper

II.—MODERN.

Political events in Europe brought the work of Jesuit missions in India to an end. In 1759 Portugal broke up the Society of Jesus within its dominions, seized its property, and imprisoned its members. France did the same in 1764, and to put an end to its unspeakable scandals Pope Clement XIV., in 1773, was forced to suppress the whole society. These events deprived the Indian Jesuit missions both of priests and resources, and for a long time they languished. It is a strange comment upon the vaunted unity of the Roman Church and the co-unity of its various orders that during the period of the Jesuit decadence the Goa clergy seized upon many of the Jesuit churches, and quietly appropriated the property. The result is, that now the Archbishop of Goa claims jurisdiction over churches outside Portuguese territory. This has given rise to endless disputes and most costly litigation. In 1538 Gregory XVI. abolished four Indo-Portuguese Bishops in British India, and required the priests to take jurisdiction from the Vicars Apostolic. Those who refused are described in the earlier issues of the "Madras Catholic Directory" as "Schismatics." This went on till 1857, when the schism was healed by two priests being allowed to submit themselves to the authority of the Archbishop of Goa.

For sixty years after the suppression of the Jesuits their missions were simply allowed to get on as best they might. In 1830 a number of Catholics joined the Protestant missions, and then the Romish authorities took the alarm. The Propaganda was urged to send out Jesuits once more, and in 1837 the second Jesuit Crusade commenced. By 1847 sixty-four priests were at work in India. As a rule the new missionaries were all on fire with the newly-kindled enthusiasm for missions; they marched enormous distances in the scorching heat of the tropical sun, and cheerfully exposed themselves to the rigours of a life in the jungles, where malaria attacked them and they suffered no small peril from wild beasts. They slept upon the damp ground; curry and rice was their staple food. The result might have been foreseen; weakened by exposure and insufficient food, in less than ten years twenty-one young priests died. Some of them, while celebrating Mass, were seized with cholera at the altar. An English priest, brother of Lord Clifford, at this time insisted upon the priests having proper food and a moderate allowance of

wine. They were properly lodged, and their comforts fixed at an irreducible minimum. This sensible policy justified its adoption, and from that time the mission has grown in usefulness and power.

It is no compliment to the Jesuits to say that among them are to be found some of the noblest missionaries of this or any age. But it is equally true that some of the Protestant societies have men who answer to the same description. One glaring misconception however must be set right. I have never seen and never heard of any priest, Jesuit, or of any other order, who practised street preaching or bazaar preaching. I know three large districts well, which have about seventy priests distributed through them; I have never met one of these priests at work in the street. They do not even profess to do street preaching. As pastors in churches and teachers in schools they hold a foremost place, but one of them said not long since he did not believe in preaching to a crowd in a bazaar, because it was casting pearls before swine to do so. The method of street preaching among Jesuits simply does not exist. Dr. Murdock, perhaps the chief authority on Mission Economics now living, says, he "has never heard of out-door preaching to the heathen by Roman Catholic missionaries such as is common among Protestant missionaries." Dr. Murray Mitchell asserts, "I have never seen them preach in public." To these I could add scores of other testimonies.

In "Catholic Missions in India," the Rev. F. Louis St. Cyr describes the work of the priests: "The missionary's habitual life is to travel from village to village, to administer the Holy Sacrament to his people. . . . He is received with triumph by the assembled Christians, who come out to meet him with flags and native music, and conduct him to the church or chapel, where, after the first usual prayer, he announces to the people the length of his stay, the order of the prayers and duties of each day, and then gives them a fervent exhortation to profit by his presence, and approach the sacraments worthily. The following is the usual order of the day in a village visitation. At three in the afternoon the catechist assembles all who are preparing for the sacraments, and reads to them a preparation for confession, which explains the whole of the dogmatic belief, and also is mixed with fervent prayers to excite the necessary sentiments in the soul. The missionary then gives a public instruction, explaining the guilt of sin, and exhorting to contrition and amendment, and shows some

striking pictures representing death, judgment, hell, and heaven, and the judgments of God upon sinners. . . . After this, "the confessions begin and continue often till midnight, to be renewed again in the earliest morning before Mass. At sunrise the bell rings to call all the people to Mass, and before it begins the catechist reads the prayers and instructions for Holy Communion, which are followed by an instruction from the priest himself. During the Holy Sacrifice the Acts of Faith, Hope, Charity, and Contrition are repeated aloud by the catechist, to prepare the people for receiving the body and blood of our Blessed Lord in Holy Communion." At 9 A.M. the priest takes his own meagre breakfast and says his prayers and office and rests a little. In the afternoon he is at the disposal of the people, settles their disputes, gives them help and advice, assists the sick and needy. In this way, fully employed, he spends a week or ten days in the village, and when the work is done the father goes to another to recommence the same labour.

Making allowance for the difference in order of service, mode of belief, and leaving out the music, I may say that the above description is also true of the Protestant itinerating missionary in India.

We may now ask what is the character of Roman Catholic Christians, and in what respects do they differ from their Hindu neighbours. It must be remembered that India is a slow-moving country, and ancient practices die hard. "Still in our ashes live their wonted fires," and the seed sown by the earlier Jesuits still brings forth fruit after its kind. The more respectable native Catholics observe caste. Pudupett, a district of Madras City, is almost entirely inhabited by this class, and in a stroll through it I have seen Saivaites and Vishnuvites wearing the distinguishing marks of their caste. The Saivaite who follows the "way of works," has on his sacred ashes and the pōtter, or circular dot, in the centre of his forehead. The Vishnuvite who practises the "way of faith," has his "namum," the trident-shaped mark of Vishnu, painted on his forehead. Round his shoulders is suspended the sacred thread. Outwardly I supposed these men to be respectable caste Hindus, but round the neck of some I saw small pictures of patron saints, and then I was informed that all the people were Roman Catholic, and, more than this, I ascertained that, after joining the Catholic Church, the converts were allowed to observe all the usages of the particular caste in which they were born. The

blend is a curious mixture of Christianity and Hinduism. Thus, in their marriages the Christian part of the ceremony is celebrated in the church by the priest; the Hindu part is performed in the house of the contracting parties. The Hindu ceremonies last three days, and on the last day is the crowning ceremony of "Sheshai," in which a Brahmin priest pronounces Hindu prayers and scatters rice upon the bride and bridegroom. They have marriage processions through the streets with music and tom-toms. Another matter in which they closely resemble the Hindus is in their car festivals. Images of Christ, the Virgin Mary, and other saints are placed in the car, precisely as Hindu gods are placed, and the cars are dragged through the streets to the accompaniment of native, and sometimes English, music. The festival ends in a grand display of fireworks. I have seen a number of native Catholic churches, and in every one I have found caste distinctions are observed. One part of the church is rigidly marked off for the Brahmin and Sudra Catholics. There is another part for the outcast and pariah.

The non-caste Roman Catholic is left in a deplorable state of ignorance, and nothing is done to raise him in the social scale. It is this particular class from which domestic servants are largely recruited, and it has given to Indian Christianity a bad name. Hundreds of Anglo-Indians will tell you that they would not have a Christian servant upon any consideration. I had observed that these Catholics go to church only twice a year, on the great festivals of Christmas and Easter-day, the rest of the year seems to be an indulgence for them. The Protestant missionary cannot hope to compete with the Jesuit; the teaching of the one is as contrary to the teaching of the other, as light is contrary to darkness. The Jesuit uses means which the other cannot use, and while one strives by mechanical acts to add to the number on his church roll, it must be remembered that the other seeks to add to the kingdom of Christ purely awakened souls. Other means are employed of which I would briefly speak. It is a wise instruction of the society to which I belong, that a missionary shall have nothing to do with land. Thirty miles from where I am now writing is a Catholic village, and the priest living in it owns land to the value of sixteen thousand rupees. This land is let out in small allotments, and half the value of the crop goes to the man who tills the land and the other half goes to the priest. In another village where we

had a s
have be
debt wi
go to
of land
are gat
am bou
of the
kind a
ple. I
course
admire
wearie
endura
the las

The
to mos
has bee
two m
Cathol
have n
to not
have n
to thei
and di
separat
They
life of
still re
habits
favour
salvati
Christ

The
some
numbe
is no t
onstra
gained
howev
value
Cathol
from
3½ per
sions
same
cent.

It
missio
metho
ble tr
sured
it is
has m
dour t
on the
less fo
histor
ought
as the
see th

had a small parish congregation, the people have been lost to us because they got into debt with the priest, and were compelled to go to his church. By this system of grants of land, money doles, gifts of cloth, many are gathered into the net of the church. I am bound to say, however, that the fathers of the Roman Church are, as a rule, very kind and inventively helpful to their people. I have had pleasant personal intercourse with some of them, and I cannot but admire their great self-denial, their unwearied persistency in work, their patient endurance of exile, which must be lonely to the last degree.

The reason of this paper will be apparent to most readers; the question all through has been, not men, but methods, and these two must still be kept apart. A Roman Catholic writer remarks: "The Jesuits have no happy hand," and it is instructive to note what they have not done. They have not given the Bible in any translation to their people. They have not kept clear and distinct the infinite difference which separates Christianity from Hinduism. They have not individualised the spiritual life of the native Catholic Christian; he still remains essentially gregarious in the habits of his church life, and trusts to the favourite saint of the greatest number for salvation rather than to the sacrifice of Christ.

The test of the value of methods is with some people the numerical result, but numbers here are fatally misleading. There is no true ratio, as Sir W. Hunter has demonstrated, between money spent and results gained on the mission field. There may, however, be a fair comparison as to the value of methods. Taking the Roman Catholic missions in India for the five years from 1880 to 1885, their rate of increase was $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per annum. Protestant missions during the same period and in the same country increased at the rate of 9 per cent. per annum.

It may be safely left to the Protestant missionaries to keep to their own well-tried methods; these are based on God's inimitable truth, and their success is so well assured that only the man who refuses to see it is the man who doubts it. Mr. Caine has made a mistake; let him have the candour to admit it, as he admitted his errors on the question of Home Rule. It is useless for him to try and square the facts of history with his theories of what things ought to be. We have to deal with things as they are, and it needs no prophet to foresee that soon India will be at the feet of

Christ our Redeemer. By His help and blessing this blessed result will be found to have been brought about by faithful servants of His who practised the simple method which He taught them when He said, "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

MOHAMMEDAN WOMEN.

BY MRS. ANNIE REICHARDT.

From *The Nineteenth Century* (London), June, 1891.

It is startling to any one who has lived in Mohammedan countries to know that here, in free, Christian, hitherto happy England, the dark shadow of the false prophet is finding a footing. Those who know the private, real, every-day life of the Mohammedan woman know also that her faults grow out of the system to which she belongs, which certainly does not hold up any high and noble aim for her to reach after.

It is a fundamental point of the Mohammedan religion that women should be secluded from and always veiled before strangers, and upon this axis their education turns. It is implanted into them with their mothers' milk.

I have seen many a bright little girl of two years old, riding astride on her mother's shoulder, her little fat rounded limbs in all their brown beauty, clothed only in a pair of anklets, a little sleeveless jacket reaching to the hips, and half a yard of muslin covering her head. One of the first things she is taught is to put up the little dimpled fingers and draw this bit of muslin across her face at the sight of a man, for whatever else a Mohammedan girl does not learn, she certainly does learn very perfectly the lesson that she must cover her face from the gaze of any strange man.

The Koran says, "The women shall be unveiled only before their husbands, fathers, fathers-in-law, children, children of their husbands, brothers, and nephews."

I will relate an instance of this which took place in Damascus, in a family with which I was well acquainted.

Lateefa Khanoom was the daughter of Z. Pasha. Her father was dead, and had died very soon after her birth, since which time she and her mother had lived in the

house of Tewfik Bey. This latter had married Lateefa Khanoom's elder sister, and on the death of his father-in-law had taken the widow and the little Lateefa under his protection, treating them in every way as his own mother and sister. In fact, the little Lateefa was to him, as to her mother and sister, the petted and spoiled darling.

Djevdar Bey, a handsome young Turkish officer stationed at Damascus, wanting a wife, set to work to find out where he could meet with a Turkish girl of good birth, and through the usual means (the women who visit the different harems and report on the charms of the girls who are found there) he made his choice of Lateefa Khanoom. His proposals were accepted by the three persons who alone formed her family, being her mother, sister, and brother-in-law. She was barely twelve! As a matter of form her consent was asked, and having seen from the latticed window the suitor chosen for her, she made no objection but silently assented to become his wife. The ring and other presents sent by the bridegroom as sealing the contract arrived in due course, and with them the command to his bride-elect to veil herself, and keep her person sacred from the eyes of every man, even her brother-in-law, and never to remain for a single moment in the same room where he was. As a matter of course whenever the poor child was sitting with her mother and sister, and the step of Tewfik Bey was heard entering the house, she would scamper away (I have seen her do it often) and envelop her tiny figure in the voluminous folds of a large veil.

In another house, as I was sitting in the reception-room with the two ladies of the family, both of whom were exceedingly refined and courteous in their manners, all at once, to my great astonishment, one of them sprang up, and, throwing herself flat on the floor, pushed herself under the divan where I was sitting, while the other squeezed herself under a large oaken chest which stood in a dark corner and was raised a few inches from the floor.

A slight sound as of some one scraping his throat made me turn my eyes to the door. A very gentlemanly young man entered, salaamed, and, standing a little within the door, made some very courteous and polite speeches, carefully keeping his eyes away from the chest and from the floor near the divan; after which he again salaamed gracefully and left the room.

The two ladies then came out of their hiding-places, and, seeing my looks of surprise and bewilderment, laughingly told me

that this young man was a younger brother of both their husbands (they were sisters-in-law), and that this business of hiding was so common to them, on account of the fact that no brother-in-law might look on their faces, that they thought nothing of it.

As there are instances of several brothers being in one family, and all living under one roof, the young wives must sometimes have very hard work to keep hidden.

However, no Moslem will go into any place where women are likely to be without giving some audible sign of his approach, nor enter a house without asking permission. Here again they have the Koran for an authority: 'Believers, enter not into the houses of other people unless ye are first permitted; and if ye are told to return, return, for it shall be better for you.'

When I lived in Cairo it was a matter of great amusement to me to hear our sakka (water-carrier), as he mounted our very long staircase (somewhere about a hundred steps), call out at almost every step, 'Das-toor!' 'Ya satir!' until he reached the top. I asked him once if calling out when he first began to ascend the stairs would not be sufficient. He said, 'No, for if by his negligence any woman should omit to veil herself or get out of his way, he might incur the guilt of seeing her without her veil, and it would be a heinous sin.'

Both men and women seem to have it ingrained in their nature that the more a woman hides herself so much the more is she worthy of the respect of man, and the more a man loves his wife the more secluded will he keep her.

For this various reasons are given. One man said to me, 'If you have a very valuable diamond or other gem of great price, you do not hang it up in the public streets where every passer-by can enjoy it and perhaps rob you of it. You hide it carefully away where even the sun may not look upon it, lest, perchance, its lustre may be dimmed; and that is the reason why we keep our "hareem" [they never use the word *wife*] carefully secluded.'

A more likely reason is the following, also given me by a Moslem: 'We are particular in insisting upon the women keeping themselves hidden or veiled, because in doing so they show a becoming respect for, and sensible appreciation of, man's position as being far above their own, and in neglecting to do it not only insult men, but themselves lose all claims to their own self-respect and the respect of men.'

Women are taught to believe that the highest term which can be applied to a hus-

band's love to look the seal more right

Woman as solely the mother or her girl that a wife—will, not the man our of woman tally un option i

Almo her pare ards he means, one obje up even held up childho no brig der age assert it with a prised in laughte it is sp head at words, speak u and not eat with

They teen, an tle wive

A fa daughte life if s may ca not say be sen known

If he the san she is lord an latter, trator c commo times a

Then his dau beneath often a wealth sitions general

band's love is, 'He will not permit the sun to look upon her;' and to be proud when the seclusion in which they are placed is more rigid and rigorous than usual.

Woman is considered among the Moslems as solely a 'thing' to be married and become the mother of children! 'Her husband or her grave' is a common saying, meaning that a woman has no right to live except as a wife—that she can have no interests, no will, no thought, but to give satisfaction to the man who has conferred on her the honour of making her his wife. Thus for a woman to remain unmarried is a thing totally unheard of, she having no right or option in the matter.

Almost as soon as she can toddle about, her parents begin to lay by something towards her 'jehaz,' or outfit, as the word means, for her marriage, as if that was the one object of her existence, and she grows up even in childhood with that one fact held up before her. She has no happy childhood, no pretty dolls, no merry games, no brightly-coloured pictures. If her tender age should, in spite of all restriction, assert itself in some poor attempt at a frolic with a little brother or sister, or she is surprised into a faint semblance of light-hearted laughter or some burst of childish prattle, it is speedily quelled by a knock on the head and a push into a corner with the words, 'For shame! a girl should never speak unless spoken to; she should be seen and not heard; her mouth is given her to eat with, but not to talk.'

They are very rarely unmarried at sixteen, and I have seen many sad-looking little wives under ten!

A father has entire authority over his daughter, even to the taking away of her life if so it seems to him good, and no one may call his conduct in question! I do not say this from hearsay or from a wish to be sensational, but have myself actually known fearful instances of it.

If her father be dead, her brother is in the same position towards her, and when she is married her husband is her supreme lord and master. After the death of the latter, his son and hers becomes the arbitrator of her fate, thus verifying the saying common among them that a woman is three times a slave.

There are cases where a man may give his daughter in marriage to some one far beneath her in rank and position. This is often done by sultans, pashas, and very wealthy men, for in such instances the positions are reversed, and the wife can, and generally does, play the tyrant at will.

Such a marriage is for motives of propriety and convenience, and the husband is made willing to play a very humble part in his wife's apartments. He cannot touch any of her property or sell any of her slaves, or even enter her own private suite of rooms if she is not in the humour to allow of it. But we are now speaking of the generality of Mohammedan women, whose lives are entirely the reverse of this, and what I want to show is that their lives, which I am sure no English woman need envy, are the natural outcome and fruit of that religion—that Koran—which is already bringing its baneful influences into England.

Four wives are allowed to every man, and as many concubines as he can buy and maintain. Their Koran tells them: 'Marry a second, and a third, and a fourth wife, but if ye find that ye cannot be just to more than one, transgress not the bounds of your ability. Of what you can buy, marry as many as you please.'

It is said by some that, as a matter of fact, the Moslem does not often marry more than one wife, and that there is much of domestic love, felicity, and peace frequently found in Mohammedan families. I repeat again, *it is said*, but I do not vouch for it, and, indeed, the Mohammedans themselves do not believe it. It is true that I have heard some of them say, 'It is much better to keep to one wife than to have the constant "bother" of the never ceasing quarrels in the harem when there are more than one,' and yet I have known those very men change their minds and bring in a younger and fresher face, notwithstanding the 'bother' and the extra expense it puts them to, excusing themselves on the ground that they only follow their apostle's example, and do what he gives them full permission for, in putting no limits to their desires.

The bringing in of a new wife is naturally the precursor to trouble and discord, and the divorce of the first one generally follows, unless the husband can afford more establishments than one. The reason of this is self-evident. The first wife, hitherto, and perhaps for many years, docile, obedient, and uncomplaining, sometimes even affectionate and devoted (I have known such cases), finding herself thrown off, uncared for, and compelled to become the servant and drudge of the new-comer, becomes restive, uncontrollable, and sometimes even fiendish in her disposition, and the husband having to choose between the tried partner of many years, and the fresh novelty, shows what he is made of by divorcing the first!

Thus it is a cruel irony to talk of conjugal love, of marriage felicity, among Moslems, whose very religion casts the poisoned shade of the upas tree on the holiest of all ties.

I have never forgiven myself for persuading a young Moslem maid of mine in Cairo to go back to her husband and continue to be an obedient, loving wife, notwithstanding previous cruelty and desertion on his part. She was a mere child in years—sixteen or seventeen—hardly more.

Poor Mabrooka! Those who talk and write so glibly of the 'laudable Moslem religion' ought to have seen this poor creature, as I told her that my religion taught me that it would be a sin on my part to keep her from her husband, and that she must try to forgive and forget, and go back and live with him.

She had been his wife for a couple or more of years, when he went away and left her with a young child in her arms—both wholly unprovided for! The infant died of starvation, and she was brought to me by the Sheikh El Mukhadameen (the chief of those who procure servants). She was very frightened when she came to me, for she had never spoken to Europeans, or indeed to Christians at all, and cried much the first few days; but it was a case of staying or going back to utter starvation. Good food had its due effect, and the fact that a young child very near the age of her own was to be her chief care soon reconciled her to living with me, child-mother though she was.

She was with me for eleven months. A more simple-hearted, docile, sweet-tempered creature I never had in my house. She was so attached to me and to my children that, as she was an orphan and had no relations, I hoped that I might be able to keep her always; but my wishes were frustrated. One day a Fellah was announced from Upper Egypt. It was her husband! He said he wanted his wife. Of course he had heard that she had been cared for and was looking well, and also that she had a nice little wardrobe, and a sum of money which in Cairo at that time was considered very substantial, and his fingers itched to have the despoiling of so many good things.

Mabrooka wept bitterly, and throwing herself at my feet begged me to keep her, saying she would be my slave all through life if I would only prevent her going back. We did all we could to persuade her husband to divorce her, promising him all her little possessions and a sum of money besides.

'She is my wife! I want my wife!' he kept on repeating doggedly, and I was obliged to make her go with him. With choking sobs and eyes filled with tears, she said: 'I will go, *ya sitti* (my lady), because you tell me that God and your religion say I must; but, oh! you do not know to what you send me!'

A few months after she came back, but so changed that it was difficult for me to recognise her. Cruelty and starvation had had their effect, and now he had again deserted her on the eve of again becoming a mother!

It may be said by Philo-Mohammedans, and I know it is said by Mohammedans themselves, that such things happen in Christian England. Yes! With grief and shame I grant it, but am thankful to add that the religion of Christian England does not abet or permit it, and this, thank God, makes a very wide difference.

One argument often brought forward by Philo-Mohammedans is that the marriage relation remains undissolved much oftener than otherwise. Such may be the case, for among the higher classes divorce is considered somewhat disreputable; not from any higher sense of its sinfulness, or any greater degree of affection on the husband's part, but because men of any position or standing are unwilling that their own particular daughter should have such a slight put upon them—that anything belonging to *them* should be obliged to submit to such a degradation at the bare caprice of another. Thus it happens that we never hear of the daughters of sultans, pashas, or any wealthy or influential people being divorced. I have heard it averred over and over again as a well-substantiated fact that the Sultan has at least one new wife every year besides innumerable concubines. What becomes of the old ones? Surely they must be divorced, for the law of El Islam will not permit of more than four wives, nor can a legally married wife become a concubine. There is therefore the always existing possibility of divorce for no reason at all, save a groundless and capricious whim on the part of the husband.

A Mohammedan girl is brought up with the idea that she has nothing to do with love. It is *ayib* (shame) for her to love her husband. She dares not do it if she would. What he asks and expects of her is to tremble before him and yield him unquestioning obedience. I have seen a husband look pleased and complacent when his wife looked afraid to lift up her eyes even when visitors were present.

Still, where treated husband the cas exempli sion of wife, or years h

Then think marry easy, one is fact! fatal w uttered ties, pe place. never a takes v given any oth her ow husband house.

A w from h she is surpris trive make ercise he has

As me sh was th nine y caring see th ness, cooked spices golden the m all rea rival t her e happy her, a but t his w of th but h and a care.

On little again 'Y sreec

Still, with all this, I have known of cases where the wife, being married young, and treated fairly well, really grew to love her husband, and I am sure it would oftener be the case but for the baneful effect of the example of their prophet and the permission of their Koran to bring in a second wife, or a 'white slave,' after a decade of years has passed away.

There are some men among them, but I think they are rare, who boast that they marry a new wife every month. 'It is so easy,' say they, 'to divorce a wife when one is tired of her!' And such is the fact! At any unexpected moment the fatal words, 'You are divorced,' may be uttered, and an utter wrenching of home ties, perhaps of many years' existence, takes place. The wife must veil herself, and never again let her husband see her. She takes with her any property that has been given to her by her husband, parents, or any other person, this being always entirely her own, and not in any way subject to her husband's will, and she leaves her husband's house, and her children.

A woman cannot, of herself, separate from her husband without his consent. If she is clever, however, she will take him by surprise at an unguarded moment, and contrive to do or say something which will make him so angry that before he can exercise sufficient self-control to stop himself, he has uttered the wished-for words.

Aysha, a servant of mine in Cairo, told me she had done it in this way. Her story was this. She was married at the age of nine years and grew up knowing no one and caring for no one but her husband. To see that his clothes were of a snowy whiteness, and his stews and pilafs carefully cooked with the full modicum of rich spices and savoury herbs, the rice of a golden colour imparted by the saffron, and the meat of an appetising tenderness, and all ready prepared at the moment of his arrival from the sook, was the sole object of her existence, and she was contented and happy, for he always spoke as if he loved her, and said 'he would never marry again, but that she should be the companion of his whole life.' She was in time the mother of three children, who all died in infancy, but her life was bound up in her husband, and as long as she had him she did not care.

One day he came in bringing with him a little girl and said that he had married again!

'Ya Madamtee!' (Oh my misfortune!) screeched Aysha, who was herself barely

twenty. 'What have I done that you should hate me all at once, and bring this strange woman between us? May your shadow never grow less; may your father find mercy; may you have length of days given you: send her back to her friends, and be not so cruel to me. Or else—why should I be in your way? divorce me since you no longer care for me.'

'No,' said her husband, 'I do not hate you, and will not divorce you. According to our prophet's words (on him be peace) we, the believers, may have more wives than one, and what you ask is impossible.'

The days went on, and Aysha found herself become the drudge and servant, and no appeals for divorce were listened to; so one day, just as it was about the usual time for him to come home, she got together all her things and put them behind the door, with her *milayeh* (large veil for covering the figure) and *boorka* (nose veil). She then set upon the new wife, beating her, and scratching her, and tearing out her hair at such a rate, that when her husband came in his rage knew no bounds and he screamed out, 'Talika bitalata!' (divorced the third time!) She had not been divorced before, but the phrase means divorced without hope of return.

In this way she got free, and catching up her bundle and veil with cat-like agility, she was out of the house before he could touch her.

This is one case out of thousands which are daily occurring, and proves what I said before, that it is the religion of the false prophet, the tenet of the Koran, to which are attributable all the faults of Mohammedan women. And can it be possible that the enlightened daughters of Christian England knowingly and willingly ally themselves to such a system by marriage with Mohammedans?

No amount of education or civilisation or public opinion can give the wife of a Mohammedan any security in the marriage tie.

Much has been said lately about the rights of woman. The gospel of Jesus Christ—the Old and New Covenant which form the basis of the religion of hitherto happy England—has given woman the right to be *queen* and sovereign of the home where she reigns as *wife*. As yet, and long may it remain so, her chief right and glory is to be the safe deposit of her husband's confidence, the guiding star of his existence, one 'in whom the heart of her husband doth safely trust, who openeth her mouth with wisdom, whose children arise up and call her

blessed ; her husband also, and he praiseth her.'

If things turn out otherwise—and it is sad that the weakness and sinfulness of human nature should often cause it to be so—yet it is not the Christian religion that is to blame.

I feel compelled to give one more example of what the Mohammedan can do, and what his religion sanctions.

It was a sad case which happened while I was at Damascus, and took place among the better class of Mohammedans.

Zeynab R. was married to a very wealthy man who was very much older than her father ; but as he was of very high standing in Moslem society, her father congratulated himself on having secured him as a husband for his child. Zeynab was only about ten years old when she was taken to her husband's house, dressed out like a doll in all the finery and jewels which he had, in accordance with Moslem rules, sent with a lavish hand before the wedding.

Years passed away before she again crossed her husband's threshold.

Once behind the 'burdayeh' or 'starr' (for both these names are given to the thick heavy curtain which shuts out the women's apartments from the rest of the world) a young girl-wife is literally buried alive, and her horizon is limited by her husband, his wives, and his slaves.

Until she becomes a mother herself she may not even think of seeing her own mother, and if, as in the case of Zeynab, by means of wealth or position her husband stands a little higher than her friends, years may pass away before she crosses her mother's threshold again.

A harem is a world in itself. The husband is the autocrat, and the larger the amount of his wealth, so much larger his harem. What passes there is never known or commented on in the outer world.

It is contrary to all Moslem ideas and Moslem etiquette for any man to make inquiries about any female that lives in the house of another.

It is but natural to suppose that among the many human beings, wives, concubines, and slaves, who compose a harem—with the head eunuch, who ostentatiously keeps them in order, but is really a little king among them—there are strong wills and fierce passions, commanding intellects and unwearied energies, which, could they be rightly guided, might be of benefit to the world ; but, being wholly without vent save among themselves, turn their little world into a perfect pandemonium.

I will not harrow the feelings of the reader by relating the cruelties perpetrated in the utter oblivion of the harem between themselves, as described to me by one of their own number, for they know that no law can reach them.

'Oh ! it is only women among themselves—who can expect women to be reasonable ? It is best to turn a deaf ear to what goes on in the women's apartments,' say the men with a contemptuous shrug of the shoulder.

The husband and autocrat, caring but for his own self-indulgence, one day lavishes caresses and loads with presents some, for the time, favoured one, and the next gives her up to all that the fury and jealousy of those who are less favoured can invent.

Zeynab became, in the course of time, the mother of two sons, but unkindness and cruelty had pulled down her constitution. Her mind seemed to give way at the hopelessness of her life. Worn to a shadow and mad with despair, she at last succeeded one day in eluding discovery by putting on the dress of a slave, and, slipping past the great burdayeh and the guardian *bowab* (the gate-keeper), fled to her father's house.

Her father had not seen her since she had left his house on her wedding day ! True, rumours were whispered about, and had been brought to him by elderly women who frequent the harems as pedlars and hawkers, but he had shrugged his shoulders and merely said 'it would not be seemly to quarrel with a man of such standing as his son-in-law for the sake of a woman.' Now that he saw the change in her he was startled and shocked as she threw herself at his feet and begged him to put an end to her life if he would, but not to send her back.

The father's heart was awakened, and she was tenderly cared for, but a long and severe illness followed, in which all hope of life was given up by the doctors.

Her father took into consultation men learned in Moslem law, and sent deputation after deputation to his son-in-law entreating him to divorce her, and saying how utterly incapable she was of returning to be his wife. The unhappy father offered not only to remit her dowry and give up all claims to any property which she had left in the harem, but to pay any sum of money demanded within reason.

Again and again the same answer came back, 'I will not divorce her ; she is my wife and must come back.' Cadis and moollahs were sent to expostulate with him, but he laughed at all they said. 'He

wanted h
have her
show her
cape him
brook no
the imm
They w
could ge

His fie
ened eve
advised l
den, lest
bard's c

Shall
next me
myself.
good au
what it
were als

—he to
sent the
show he

The y
raised h
she gav
the vict

This
sensatio
and dat
the pres
land wh
But wh
Moslem
suprem
neither
him the

married
own pe
a life, l
lives to
clutche
women
sidered
could c
restless
lish m

of her
husban
wealth
He hac
and sp
countr
band a
and af
treaty
was bo
fleeing
For th
to acc
of his
heinou

wanted her back, sick or well, and he would have her; not because he loved her, but to show her the consequences of trying to escape him. He was a Moslem, and would brook no interference between himself and the inmates of his harem. Mashalla! They would laugh at his beard if they could get off so easily.'

His fiendish looks as he said this frightened even those hardened men, and they advised her father to keep her carefully hidden, lest she should fall a victim to her husband's cruelty.

Shall I—dare I—put on paper what his next message was? I did not see it done myself. I was told—yes, I was told on good authority and in bated whispers—what it was. He took her two sons, who were also his sons—those little darling boys—he took them, wrung their necks, and sent their dead bodies still palpitating to show her what he had in store for her!

The young mother, not yet twenty, never raised her head after the one wild shriek she gave, and in a few days she too died, the victim of despair.

This is no exaggerated tale, no piece of sensational fiction. If I dared give names and dates, I am not sure but what now at the present moment there are some in England who could corroborate my statement. But what need have I of witnesses? Every Moslem knows that his religion gives him supreme control in his harem, and that neither law nor public opinion can touch him there. I have known English women married to Moslems who, having in their own persons experienced the reality of such a life, have made it the one object of their lives to get their daughters out of the clutches of that religion, so baneful to women, before they reached the age considered marriageable among Moslems. I could call witnesses to the bitter tears and restless, sleepless anxiety with which an English mother watched the innocent gambols of her infant daughter, although her own husband was a man of education, of great wealth, and of a most influential position. He had been often in England and France, and spoke the languages of both those countries with ease. He was as good a husband as his religion would allow him to be, and after years of continued tears and entreaty on the part of his wife he actually was bold enough to wink at the mother's fleeing with the child to a place of refuge. For this amount of kindness he was called to account by the ulemas and learned men of his religion, on the plea that it was a heinous sin against the Koran to keep his

daughter where she could not be married to a Moslem. He was ordered to command her return, but her mother hid her and changed her own name. This was some years ago, and I do not know what the sequel has been.

Having given an instance of a husband's cruelty as shielded by the Koran and the Mohammedan religion, I will now proceed to show how a naturally amiable and good-hearted man is bid to look upon his wife by the light of that same Koran.

On an Austrian steamer I met an Egyptian Effendi who seemed a man of intelligence and wealth. He had his wife with him, and had secured the ladies' cabin for her. There she remained with her three little children and a black slave, never coming out once for a breath of fresh air during the whole voyage.

The Effendi spoke of her in a very patronising, good-natured sort of way. He told me that he was just returning from Europe, and that, having been obliged to go there on business, he had taken his wife with him, to have an operation performed on her eyes for cataract, she being perfectly blind through that disease.

On my showing some surprise at his incurring so much trouble and expense for a wife, this being an uncommon thing for a Moslem to do, he said, 'It is *sowab* (a meritorious action) that she should be enabled to look upon her children. It is *sowab* with God. To see a blind dog who cannot look upon her puppies is a painful sight. How much more a human being! for *after all a woman is a human being*. But now that she can see them she has nothing more to wish for and is very grateful to me.'

All this and much more of the like nature was said with an air of great benevolence and condescension, and although he looked and spoke as if he knew that he had done a very praiseworthy and humane action, which showed the goodness of his nature, I was bound to give him his due. It was indeed, especially thirty years ago, a wonderful thing for a Moslem husband to do. Perhaps the fact that the three children were all boys had something to do with it, for most Moslems are very fond and proud of their sons.

It is said the Koran enjoins the kind treatment of the wife, and so it does after a fashion which yet clearly gives full license to the way the Moslems treat their wives. It says, 'Treat them kindly; and if ye would leave them, may God order it for the best.' 'If ye would change your wives for

others, take not aught back from what ye had given them.'

This law demands no reason from the husband for divorcing his wife; nor does it give her any claim or legal power by which she may oppose his wishes in this respect; and it is in the selfishness of human nature that the strong shall triumph over the weak, and consider any and every exercise of power, however subtle or cruel it may be, as only the natural right and due given to man by God.

Man's will, capricious and fickle and totally unreasonable though it be, being made, therefore, the pivot on which these marriages rest, surely we know enough to be sure, in spite of all that Philo-Moslems may say, that the life of a Mohammedan woman is by no means to be envied.

Much has been written about 'woman's rights,' and 'women of to-day,' but the old words uttered thousands of years ago by our Saviour Himself, 'What, therefore, God hath joined together let not man put asunder,' have given woman her real status in this world. That she takes her place as a *helpmeet* to man she owes to the Christian religion, and never in the Moslem's Koran will she find such courage and strength as in the beautiful words, written by an inspired Apostle, 'Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave Himself for it.'

THE REAL STATUS OF WOMEN IN ISLÂM.

BY THE HON. MR. JUSTICE AMEER ALI, CALCUTTA.

From *The Nineteenth Century* (London), September, 1891.

I HAVE read with some surprise the article by Mrs. Reichardt on Mohammedan Women in the June number of this Review. I should have thought that a Christian lady, and presumably an English woman, would speak with some reserve of a teacher who is regarded with veneration by forty millions of Her Majesty's subjects in the East, and would have the good taste not to offend their religious susceptibilities by the unnecessary use of mediæval vituperation. I am not concerned, however, with the manner of the writer's statements, but with the matter thereof. The standard of good taste is variable, and differs in each individual. Mrs. Reichardt has strung together a number of stories, partly ridiculous and partly disgusting, the scenes of

which are laid in Syria and Egypt, where the lady seems to have resided, and upon the force of them she asks her readers to declare that the Islâmic system is a curse, and the status of women under it low. No doubt her manner of attack will to some extent answer its purpose, and create, or rather accentuate, the existing aversion to Islâm—an aversion which, fostered originally by designing ecclesiastics like Pope Gregory the Seventh, has existed in Christendom from the time of the Crusades.

Few of Mrs. Reichardt's readers will stop to consider whether her tales are genuine or probable—whether they have any bearing on the wider issue she has raised, namely, the comparative status of women under Islâm and Christianity—or to think that the same abuses which she recites as occurring in some Mohammedan families, exist sometimes in grosser form in Christian families. They will be carried away by the disgust of the moment. Some of her stories, instead of reflecting any discredit on the Mussulmans, to my philistine mind convey a decidedly favourable impression. For example, even Mrs. Reichardt may approve of the feeling (however ignorantly expressed) which actuated the water-carrier in giving a warning to her before entering her apartments. And I think that modesty, however exaggerated, is not out of place in this planet of ours.

As regards the other stories, I will not indulge in *tu quoques*. I shall not point to the tale told by the daily reports of trials in the police courts—a tale not dependent on the veracity of gossips or the colouring of missionary imagination—of parents maiming their offspring or beating them to death, of husbands trampling on their wives with hob-nailed boots, of the abominable brutalities inflicted on women and children by professed Christians; I shall not dwell upon the revelations in the divorce courts (not to refer to anything else), nor speak of the seething mass of immorality, depravity, and cruel heartlessness existing in the heart of Christian England. I would not be justified in pointing to the revolting sights one sees in the populous towns of Christendom as the outcome of Christianity. I would only ask Mrs. Reichardt to recognise that the crimes or the follies committed by Moslems may spring from other causes than their religion. Neither virtue nor vice is the peculiar property of any race or creed, and the lower nature of man will find expression in spite of the teachings of Christ or Mohammed.

The writer, however, is neither logical

nor historical. The status of women in the English state of society is a thing more in the future than in the past. Is she not a free woman in the colonies, in Mexico, in the same state against the law? Is it just to pour in impossible people, to Moslems?

With the proceed to ardt's argu influence, apart, her understand four char, and the lo plurality force. It which has cal attack Mrs. Reichardt the New C women no

An exam under wha nant' wil tion is. ' father's h servant; minor. I dispose of The daug when they were inva and wive method o down the shekels— money—b tice accor bride and lygamy v Child-mar among th no limitat to divorc write a bi wife for n ing no po apply eve

nor historically correct in her exposition of the status of women in Islâm. She compares, albeit unconsciously, the status of an English woman in the year 1891 with a state of society in Syria and Egypt resembling more the conditions of life in Europe in the fifteenth century. But regarding this I shall have to say a few words later. Is she not aware that in many continental countries, in Russia specially, in the Spanish Colonies of South America, and in Mexico, the position of women is open to the same criticisms which she has levelled against the Syrian and Egyptian Moslems? Is it just or honest, by retailing stories, poured into willing ears, of possible and impossible incidents among semi-civilised people, to create a prejudice against all Moslems?

With these preliminary observations, I proceed to deal with the gist of Mrs. Reichardt's arguments. 'Upas-tree,' 'baleful influence,' and other such-like phrases apart, her indictment against Islâm, if I understand her rightly, resolves itself into four charges—viz. the seclusion of women and the low status assigned to them; the plurality of wives and the facility of divorce. It is the old oft-repeated story which has formed the burden of ecclesiastical attacks on Islâm for several centuries. Mrs. Reichardt takes credit to 'the Old and the New Covenant,' for the position which women now occupy in Christendom.

An examination of the position of women under what the writer calls the 'Old Covenant' will show how groundless that assertion is. The Hebrew maiden, even in her father's house, stood in the position of a servant; her father could sell her if a minor. In case of his death, the sons could dispose of her at their will and pleasure. The daughter inherited nothing, except when there were no male heirs. Marriages were invariably arranged by the parents, and wives were bought upon a recognised method of valuation. The Mosaic law set down the price at a uniform rate of 50 shekels—nearly 4*l.* sterling of English money—but it nevertheless varied in practice according to the station in life of the bride and bridegroom. Unrestrained polygamy was practised among all classes. Child-marriage was frequent, as it still is, among the Jews of Palestine. There was no limitation on the power of the husband to divorce the wife. It was sufficient 'to write a bill of divorcement' and dismiss the wife for no cause whatsoever: the wife having no power to divorce the husband nor to apply even to the judge to release her from

an irksome bondage. This was the condition of women under the vaunted 'Old Covenant.'

Before I deal with their position under the 'New Covenant,' it may be as well to show what their condition was among the settled pagan Arabs, and in the neighbouring empire of Persia. Among the former, who were mostly influenced by the corrupt and effete civilisation of the neighbouring empires, a woman was considered a mere chattel; she formed an integral part of the estate of her husband or her father, and the widows of a man descended to his eldest son by right of inheritance, as any other portion of his patrimony. Hence the frequent unions between stepsons and mothers-in-law, which, when subsequently forbidden by Islâm, were branded under the name of *Nikâh-ul-Mukt* ('shameful or odious marriages'). Even polyandry was practised by the half-Jewish, half-Sabæan tribes of Yemen, and female infanticide was common.

The corruptness of morals in Persia was fearful. There was no recognised law of marriage, or, if any existed, it was completely ignored. In the absence of any fixed rule in the Zend-Avesta as to the number of wives a man might possess, the Persians indulged in a multitude of regular matrimonial connections, besides having a number of concubines.

What did Christianity do to improve the position of women? It may be, as it is said, that Jesus mixed familiarly with women, and discoursed to them about His teachings. But of Christianity in its relation to womankind the less said the better. In the early ages, when the religion of the people, high and low, the ignorant and educated, consisted only of the adoration of the mother of Jesus, the Church of Christ had placed the sex under a ban. The 'Fathers of the Church' wrote upon the enormities of women, their evil tendencies, their inconceivable malignity; and Tertullian, that holy saint, described them as 'the devil's gateway, the unsealer of the forbidden tree, the deserter of the divine law, the destroyer of God's image—man.' And St. Chrysostom pronounced women to be a 'necessary evil, a natural temptation, a desirable calamity, a domestic peril, a deadly fascination, a painted ill.'

The Orthodox Church excluded women from the exercise of all but the lowliest religious functions. They were excluded absolutely from society, they were prohibited from appearing in public, from going to feasts or banquets. They were directed to

remain in seclusion, to observe silence, to obey their husbands, and to apply themselves to weaving and spinning and cooking. If they ever went out they were to be clothed from head to foot. Such was the position of women in Christianity when Mariolatry was recognised and practised by all classes. In later times, and in the interval which elapsed between the overthrow of the Western Empire and the rise of modern society in Europe, a period which has been described as one of 'rapine, falsehood, tyranny, lust, and violence,' Christianity, by introducing convents and nunneries, in some respects improved the lot of women. But the convents were not always the haunts of virtue, nor the inculcation of celibacy the surest safeguard of chastity. The *Registrum Visitationum*, or the diary of the pastoral visits of Archbishop Rigaud, throws a peculiar light upon the state of morality and the position of the sex during the most glorious epoch of the Age of Faith. The rise of Protestantism made no difference in the status of women. Jesus had treated woman with humanity; his followers excluded her from justice.

The age of chivalry is generally supposed to extend from the beginning of the eighth to the close of the fourteenth century—a period, be it noted, almost synchronous with the Saracenic domination in Spain. During this period, in spite of the halo which poetry and romance have cast around the conditions of society, women were the frequent subjects of violence. Force and fraud were the distinguishing characteristics of the golden age of Christian chivalry. Polygamy was practised by all classes;morganatic and left-handed marriages were not confined to the aristocracy. Even the clergy, frequently forgetting their vows of celibacy, contracted more than one legal or illegal union. History proves conclusively that, until very recent times, polygamy was not considered so reprehensible as it is now. The German reformers, as Hallam points out, even so late as the sixteenth century, admitted the validity of a second or a third marriage contemporaneously with the first, in default of issue and other similar causes. Charlemagne, as is well known, had several wives.

Whether the unlicensed polyandry prevalent among certain classes in the West is preferable to the licensed polygamy practised by certain sections in the East, is a question on which I do not offer an opinion. Sufficient it is for me to say that the position of women under Christianity—until culture and progress in material develop-

ment and humanitarian science called into existence that unwritten code of honour which is now in force among the *really* civilised communities of the West—the lot of Christian women was by no means so enviable as Mrs. Reichardt would fain make us believe. Under Justinian, the champion of orthodoxy, the streets of Constantinople were the scenes of the grossest and most revolting outrages. In the streets of Alexandria, a woman, whose only crimes were her beauty and her learning, was torn to pieces by the following of a Christian saint. Had St. Cyril written a book on women he would probably have agreed with the Hindoo legislator, Manu, who declared that a wife guilty of disobedience to her husband should be torn to pieces by wild dogs where the four highways meet. In mediæval times, women were outraged, carried into captivity, thrown into dungeons, scourged by the feudal chiefs of devoutly Christian Europe. They were burnt, they were drowned.

Mohammed appeared at this epoch. It was not his business to go about the countryside unhinging people's minds by announcing the immediate advent of 'the Kingdom of Heaven.' He applied himself to evolve order out of chaos. He had seen the immorality of the Syrian Christians; he had before his eyes the depravity of the settled Arabs and Jews. He restrained the power of divorce; practically forbade polygamy and concubinage, and placed women on a pedestal hardly approached (say what fanatics may) up to that time.

I have already shown the cruel powers possessed by the Hebrew husband under the 'Old Covenant' to divorce his defenceless wife. Among the Romans, the legality of the practice of divorce was recognised from the earliest times. The laws of the Twelve Tables admitted divorce; and if the Romans, as is stated by their admirers, did not take advantage of this law until five hundred years after the foundation of their city, it was not because they were more exemplary than other nations, but because the husband possessed the more cogent power of summarily putting his wife to death for acts like poisoning, drinking, and the substitution of a spurious child. But the wife had no right to sue for a divorce; and if she solicited separation her temerity made her liable to punishment. In the later republic, the frequency of divorce was at once the sign, the cause, and the consequence of the rapid depravation of morals.

'The ambiguous word which contains the precept of Jesus is flexible to any interpre-

tation that demand.' time Jesus has joined had no of the torren not pause of his wor makes fo word) the shows how the emerg Christian to a blind probably bryonic e The rule noble ser considere sufficient ous provi tian coun

Two o mention lowed H wives (M the tradi pels be c those pas then on what Sel Jesus wa to the so

Amom divorce limited. manity wives. when M corded the cust proval a lated to ciety. pleased slaves, than di under custom the mi barous The cu of the p the pr allowed to hus He per tinct a might renew should

tation that the wisdom of the legislator can demand.' We may well suppose that at the time Jesus uttered the words, 'What God has joined, let no man put asunder,' he had no other idea than that of stemming the torrent of moral depravity, and he did not pause to consider the ultimate tendency of his words. The subsequent rule, which makes fornication (using the translated word) the only ground of valid divorce, shows how abundantly Jesus was alive to the emergency. But the 'wisdom' of later Christian legislators has not confined itself to a blind adherence to a precept laid down probably to suit the requirement of an embryonic community, and delivered verbally. The rule may be regarded as inculcating a noble sentiment; but that it should be considered as the typical law of divorce is sufficiently controverted by the multitudinous provisions of successive ages in Christian countries.

Two of the Christian Gospels make no mention of the reason for which Jesus allowed His followers 'to put away' their wives (Mark x. 11 and Luke xvi. 18). If the traditions recorded in these two Gospels be considered of higher authority than those passing under the name of Matthew, then one can easily perceive the force of what Selden says, that by an evasive answer Jesus wanted to avoid giving offence either to the school of Shammai or that of Hillel.

Among the pagan Arabs, the power of divorce possessed by the husband was unlimited. They recognised no rule of humanity or justice in the treatment of their wives. Such was the position of woman when Mohammed appeared. All his recorded sayings show that he looked upon the custom of divorce with extreme disapproval and considered its practice as calculated to undermine the foundations of society. He repeatedly declared that nothing pleased God more than the emancipation of slaves, and nothing displeased him more than divorce. It was impossible, however, under existing conditions to abolish the custom entirely. His mission was to mould the minds of an uncultured and semi-barbarous community to a higher development. The custom was interwoven with the habits of the people, and had become sanctified by the practice of ages; and accordingly he allowed the exercise of the power of divorce to husbands under stringent conditions. He permitted to divorced parties three distinct and separate periods within which they might endeavour to become reconciled and renew their conjugal intercourse; but should all attempts to become reconciled

prove unsuccessful, then the third period, in which the final separation was declared to have arrived, supervened. In case of conjugal disputes, he advised reconciliation by means of arbiters chosen by the two disputants.

As usual, 'the Fathers of the Church' (and 'Fathers' are to be found in every church) have taken up the temporary permission as the positive rule, and ignored the principles of humanity, justice, and equity inculcated by the Master. I consider, however, that the rules laid down by them are far more humane and just towards women than those of the most perfect Roman law, developed in the bosom of the Christian Church. According to the Moslem legists, the wife also is entitled to demand a separation on the ground of ill-usage, want of proper maintenance, and various other causes, and the Kazi (the judge) is empowered to decree separation if the facts are established. In every case where the divorce originates with the husband, he has to give up to the wife everything he settled upon her at her marriage. The frequent admonitions in the Koran against separations, the repeated recommendation to heal quarrels by private reconciliation, show how sacred the Arab legislator held the marriage tie:

And if ye fear a breach between them (man and wife), then send a judge chosen from his family, and a judge chosen from her family, &c. &c.

Mrs. Reichardt says, as other Christian controversialists have said before, that Mohammed allowed his followers, besides the four legitimate wives, to take to themselves any number of female slaves. A simple statement of the regulation on this point will show at once how opposed this notion is to the true precepts of Islâm.

Whoso among you hath not the means to marry a free believing woman, then let him marry such of your maid-servants whom your right hands possess and who are believers. This is allowed unto him among you who is afraid of committing sin; but if ye abstain from allying yourself with slaves it will be better for you.

Concubinage, the union of people standing to each other in the relation of master and slave, without the sanction of matrimony, existed among the Arabs, the Jews, the Christians, and all the other nations. The Prophet did not in the beginning denounce the custom, but towards the end of his career he expressly forbade it.

And you are permitted to marry virtuous women who are believers, and virtuous women of those who have been given the scriptures before you, when you have provided them their portions, liv-

ing chastely with them without fornication, and not taking concubines.

How favourably does the tolerant spirit displayed in the first part of this commandment compare with the exclusiveness of Christian ecclesiasticism, which refused to recognise as valid or lawful the union of a Christian with a non-Christian, unless he happened to be a king! The stake was the lot of the 'infidel' who had the temerity to marry a *Christian*! Mohammed's rule, it must be admitted, was a distinct advance in humanity.

Now as regards polygamy, which is always cast into the teeth of Islâm by unthinking antagonists, Mohammed found it practised, not only among his own people, but amongst the people of the neighbouring countries, where it assumed some of its most frightful aspects. There was no limit to the number of wives a Jew or a Zoroastrian might marry; and in spite of the endeavour of Justinian to correct the evil, the case was the same with the Christians. Polygamy flourished unchecked among all classes of people, and the wretched women, with the exception of the first wife selected according to priority of time, laboured under severe disabilities.

Mohammed enforced as one of the essential teachings of his creed 'respect for women,' and his followers, in their love and reverence for his celebrated daughter, proclaimed her 'the Lady of Paradise,' as the representative of her sex. Our 'Lady of Light' is the embodiment of all that is ideal in womanhood—of all that is pure and true and holy in her sex. And she has been followed by a long succession of women, who have consecrated their sex by their virtues. Their noble lives and works have always furnished an example to the women of succeeding ages to venerate and follow.

'Paradise is at the feet of the mother,' said the Prophet of Islâm. This sweet and holy teaching which inculcates that love and devotion to the mother is the greatest act of piety, gives some idea of the high position which women occupy in Islâm. The Arabian Prophet prohibited the custom of conditional marriages, and, though at first temporary marriages were tacitly allowed, in the third year of the Hegira these also were forbidden. Mohammed secured to women, in his system, rights which they had not before possessed, and placed them on a footing of perfect equality with men in the exercise of all legal powers and functions. He restrained polygamy by limiting the maximum number of contemporaneous marriages, and by making *abso-*

lute equity towards all obligatory on the man. It is worthy of note that the clause in the Koran which contains the permission to contract four contemporaneous marriages is made dependent upon the condition that the man is able to deal *equitably* and *justly* with all the four wives. The condition, therefore, cuts down the permission to its legitimate dimensions. The passage runs thus: 'You may marry two, three, or four wives, but not more.' The subsequent lines declare, 'but if you cannot deal equitably and justly with all, you shall marry only one.' The extreme importance of this proviso, bearing especially in mind the meaning which is attached to the word 'equity' (*adl*) in the Koranic teachings, has not been lost sight of by the great thinkers of the Moslem world.

Even so early as the third century of the Hegira, during the reign of Al-Mâmun, the first Mutazalite doctors taught that the developed Koranic laws inculcated monogamy. And though the cruel persecutions of the mad bigot Mutaw-wakkil prevented the general diffusion of their teachings, the conviction is gradually forcing itself on all sides, in all advanced Moslem communities, that polygamy is as much opposed to the teachings of Mohammed as it is to the general progress of civilised society and true culture.

In India more than 95 per cent. of the Moslems are monogamists; in Persia 98 per cent., according to Colonel Macgregor's testimony. In Arabia and Turkey the practice of plurality of wives is confined to a very small class of people (compare Van Lennep and Niebuhr, both as worthy of credit as the authoress of the article under notice).

As regards divorce, speaking from a somewhat extensive experience of this province—which alone contains nearly twenty-two millions of Mussulmans—I know of only half-a-dozen cases occurring within the space of twenty-five years among the respectable classes—one of which, however, emanated from the wife. In all these cases there were faults on both sides. If the women nowadays have not the same facility as before for obtaining a divorce on the ground of ill-treatment, &c., the blame lies at other doors. Under the British rule, there seems to be no machinery for administering that branch of the Mohammedan law. In this respect, it must be said, the English in India have acted differently from the French in Algeria, who have maintained and improved the indigenous institutions. I hope, however, that the

time is
will pre
the 'Fa
the Kaz
biters
the 'Ol

The
where i
of an o
tice am
from th
was a f
nians;
harem
lic gaze
hold th
The gy
terpart
privacy
ladies
natural
various
import
it not
explicit
time E
ca, I s
at all
the gr
whose
manit
due to
legitim
fying
Babyl
and t
best e
times

Th
into t
of na
ever,
cover
it Ch
any o
in ea
the t
Meco
step
stam
the A
ages
amon
Heta
jingl
half
Upp
ably
I an
four
exis

time is not far distant when the Moslems will prefer to follow the Prophet instead of the 'Fathers;' and will, in the absence of the Kazi, decide conjugal disputes by 'arbiters' instead of imitating the followers of the 'Old Covenant.'

The system of the seclusion of females where it exists among Moslems is a survival of an older growth. It had been in practice among most of the nations of antiquity from the earliest times. The gynaiikonitis was a familiar institution among the Athenians; and the inmates of an Athenian *harem* were as jealously guarded from public gaze as the members of a Persian household then, or of an Indian household now. The gynaiikonomoi, like his Oriental counterpart, was the faithful warder of female privacy, and rigorously watched over the ladies of Athens. The seclusion of women naturally gave birth to the caste of Hetairai, various members of whom played such an important part in Athenian history. Were it not for the extraordinary and almost inexplicable spectacle presented by the Byzantine Empire and modern Europe and America, I should have said that in every society at all advanced in the arts of civilised life, the growth of the unhappy class of beings whose existence is alike a reproach to humanity and a disgrace to civilisation was due to the withdrawal of women from the legitimate exercise of their ennobling, purifying, and humanising influence. The Babylonians, the Etruscans, the Athenians, and the pre-Islamite Meccans furnish the best exemplification of this view in ancient times.

The enormity of the social canker eating into the heart and poisoning the life-blood of nations in modern times is due, however, to the spread of a godless materialism covered with a thin veneer of religion, be it Christianity, be it Mohammedanism, or any other form of creed. Mohammed had, in early life, observed with pain and sorrow the terrible depravity prevailing among the Meccans, and he took the most effective step suited to the age and the people to stamp out the evil. Among the women of the Arabs fashion was as strong as in other ages and countries. It was the fashion among them to imitate the example of the Hetairai (*Kiyân*) and walk in the streets jingling their anklets with their bosoms half exposed. Those who have travelled in Upper Egypt or Lower Bengal will probably understand the immodesty to which I am referring. The Prophet of Islâm found the custom of seclusion of women existing among the Persians and other Ori-

ental communities; he perceived its advantages, and it is possible that in view of the widespread laxity of morals among all classes of people, he recommended to women the observance of privacy. But to suppose for a moment that he ever intended his recommendation should assume its present inelastic form or that he ever allowed or enjoined the *seclusion* of women, is wholly opposed to the spirit of his reforms. The Koran itself affords no warrant for holding that the seclusion of women is a part of the new gospel.

O Prophet! speak to thy wives and to thy daughters, and to the wives of the faithful, that they let their wrappers fall low.

And speak to the believing women, that they refrain their looks and observe continence; and that they display not their ornaments except those which are external, and that they draw their kerchiefs over their bosoms.

The women were also enjoined not to take off their outer garments in the presence of any male except their fathers, husbands, or brothers. (This is supposed to mean unveiling themselves.)

The reasons for these directions are easy to understand in the midst of the social and moral chaos from which he was endeavouring, under God's guidance, to evolve order. They were wise and beneficent injunctions, having for their object the promotion of decency among women, the improvement of their dress and demeanour, and their protection from insult. It is a mistake, therefore, to suppose there is anything in the law which tends to the perpetuation of the custom. Considerable light is thrown on the lawgiver's recommendation for female privacy, by the remarkable immunity from restraint or seclusion which the members of his family always enjoyed. Ayesha, the daughter of Abû Bakr, who was married to Mohammed on Khadija's death, personally conducted the insurrectionary movement against Ali. She commanded her own troops at the famous 'Battle of the Camel.' Fâtima, 'our Lady of Light,' often took part in the discussions regarding the succession to the Caliphate, and her sermons, breathing that sweet nobility, that divine purity, which distinguished her character, are still extant. The grand-daughter of Mohammed, Zainab, the sister of Hussain, shielded her youthful nephew from the Ommeyyodes after the butchery of Kerbela, and by her indomitable spirit awed the ferocious soldiery of Yezid.

According to Von Hammer,

the *harem* is a sanctuary: it is prohibited to strangers, not because women are considered un-

worthy of confidence, but on account of the sacredness with which custom and manners invest them. The degree of reverence which is accorded to women throughout higher Asia and Europe (among Mohammedan communities) is a matter capable of the clearest demonstration.

Hamilton, the translator of the Hedāya, dealing with the chapter on Decorum, says, 'This seclusion is a result of *jealousy* or *pride*, and not of any legal *injunction*, as appears in this and several other parts of the Hedāya.' And Marsden, in his *Travels*, says, 'The Arab settlers in Java never observed the custom (of seclusion of women), and the Javanese Mussulman women enjoy the same amount of freedom as their Dutch sisters.'

In the early centuries of Islām, almost until the extinction of the Saracenic empire in the East, women continued to occupy as exalted a position as in modern society. Zobeida, the wife of Hōrān, plays a conspicuous part in the history of the age, and by her virtues, as well as by her accomplishments, leaves an honoured name to posterity. Humieda, the wife of Fārūk, a Medinite citizen, left for many years the sole guardian of her minor son, educates him to become one of the most distinguished jurists of the day. Sukinah, or Sakina, the daughter of Hussain and the granddaughter of Ali, was the most brilliant, most accomplished, and most virtuous woman of her time—'la dame des dames de son temps, la plus belle, la plus gracieuse, la plus brillante de qualités,' as Perron calls her. Herself no mean scholar, she prized the converse of learned and pious people. Būran, the wife of the Caliph Māmūn, Ummul-Fazl, Māmūn's sister, married to the eighth Imām of the house of Ali, Umm-i-Habil, Māmūn's daughter, were all famous for their scholarship.

In the fifth century of the Hegira, the Sheikha Shuhda, designated *Fakhrunnissa* ('the glory of women'), lectured publicly at the Masjid-i-Jāma of Bagdad, to large audiences, on literature, rhetoric, and poetry. She occupies in the annals of Islām a position of equality with the most distinguished *ulemas*. What would have befallen this lady had she flourished among the fellow-religionists of St. Cyril can be judged by the fate of Hypatia. Possibly she would not have been torn to pieces by enthusiastic Christians, but she would to a certainty have been burnt as a witch. Dzat-ul-Hemma, corrupted into Dzemma, 'the lion-heart,' the heroine of many battles, fought side by side with the bravest knights.

It is a calumny, therefore, to say that the Islāmic system has lowered the status of women. The Teacher who, in an age when no country, no system, no community gave any right to woman, maiden or married, mother or wife—who, in a country where the birth of a daughter was considered a calamity, secured to the sex rights which are only unwillingly and under pressure being conceded to them by the civilised nations in the nineteenth century—deserves the gratitude of humanity. If Mohammed had done nothing more, his claim to be a benefactor of mankind would have been indisputable. Even under the laws as they stand at present in the pages of the legists, the legal position of Moslem females may be said to compare favourably with that of European women. As long as a Mohammedan woman is unmarried she remains under the parental roof, and until she attains her majority she is to some extent under the control of the father or his representative. As soon, however, as she is of age, the law vests in her all the rights which belong to her as an independent human being. She is entitled to share in the inheritance of her parents along with her brothers, and, though the proportion is different, the distinction is founded on the relative position of brother and sister. A woman who is *sui juris* can under no circumstance be married without her own express consent, 'not even by the Sultan.' Centuries after this principle was laid down by the Moslem jurists the sovereigns and chiefs of Christendom were in the habit of forcibly marrying women to their subjects. On her marriage she does not lose her individuality. She does not cease to be a separate member of society. An ante-nuptial settlement by the husband in favour of the wife is a necessary condition, and on his failure to make a settlement the law presumes one in accordance with the social position of the wife. A Moslem marriage is a civil act needing no priest, requiring no ceremonial. The contract of marriage gives the man no power over the woman's person beyond what the law defines, and none whatever upon her goods and property. Her rights as a mother do not depend for their recognition upon the idiosyncrasies of individual judges. Her earnings acquired by her own exertions cannot be wasted by a prodigal husband, nor can she be ill-treated with impunity by one who is brutal. She acts, if *sui juris*, in all matters which relate to herself and her property in her own individual right, without the intervention of husband or father. She can sue her

debtors
necessity
cover o
tinues t
her fat
all the r
All the
woman
by the c
by the
Taken a
hammer
than th
whilst
cidedly

Nine
opment
civilisa
and cl
place th
and An
the me
etiquet
nises t
respect
pire, th
ity, co
the las
in Sib
wept a
Italian
eries o
went i
from l
have n
ings o
longed

If t
ent da
tian si
is not
the ge
of cul
of sav
Tarta
whelm
ruin a
another
positi
time
system

T
From

W
mont
the 'C

debtors in the open courts, without the necessity of joining a next friend or under cover of her husband's name. She continues to exercise, after she has passed from her father's house into her husband's home, all the rights which the law gives to men. All the privileges which belong to her as a woman and a wife are secured to her, not by the courtesies which 'come and go,' but by the actual text in the book of law. Taken as a whole, the legal status of a Mohammedan woman is not more unfavourable than that of many a European woman, whilst in many respects she occupies a decidedly better position.

Nineteen centuries of progressive development working with the legacy of a prior civilisation, under the most favourable racial and climatic conditions, have tended to place the women in certain parts of Europe and America on a higher social level than the men—have given birth to a code of etiquette which, at least ostensibly, recognises the right of women to higher social respect. And yet a great and civilised empire, the professed champion of Christianity, condemns women to the punishment of the lash and the outrages of fiendish guards in Siberian mines, and the people who wept so profusely over the wrongs of the Italian Poerio have not a tear for the miseries of these wretched women; they who went into hysterics over the myths wafted from Bulgaria to the shores of Great Britain have no word of reprobation for the sufferings of the women of a race to which belonged Mary and Magdalen!

If the Mohammedan women in the present day are not so advanced as their Christian sisters in the West, their backwardness is not due to the Koranic teachings, but to the general extinction among the Moslems of culture and progress under the avalanche of savagery which issued from the wilds of Tartary in the thirteenth century, overwhelming the whole of Western Asia with ruin and desolation. But if they do not in another hundred years attain to the social position of European women, there will be time enough to declaim against Islâm as a system and dispensation.

THE RIVAL "HOLY COATS."

From *The Church Times* (Ch. Eng.), London, August 21, 1891.

WHEN the fanatical and extremely Ultramontanist Bishop Arnoldi of Trier exposed the "Holy Coat" for the veneration of the

faithful in the year 1844, he had the grace to tell his flock that the authenticity of the ancient relic was no article of faith. It need hardly be said that the peasant pilgrims of Germany, Belgium, France, and other lands, who flocked day after day in their hundreds of thousands to Trier, paid more regard to the Bishop's action than to the Bishop's caution. They exalted the genuineness of the "Heilige Rock," the holy tunic, into an article of faith.

There are two ways of testing the authenticity of a relic. The Apostle's charge to "prove all things" is acknowledged as obligatory, both by the half-heathenish peasant and by the most scientific Catholic theologian. But by "proof" they understand two very different processes. The test of the one is, "Will the relic work a miracle?" The test of the other is, "What is the true witness of historical research as to this relic?" A sincere appeal to history can never be an attack upon the Catholic Church or Catholic doctrine; it is rather the only logical outcome of an acceptance of the great Vincentian canon of Catholicity. The Church has suffered cruelly from the imposition of false relics upon the veneration of the faithful. The Council of Saragossa in 592 had the courage to propose that the relics which were at that time brought in quantities from the East to the West should be tested by the ordeal of fire. At the beginning of the twelfth century two monks discovered in Jerusalem, and brought to Monte Cassino, a piece of the towel with which our Blessed Lord wiped the feet of His Apostles. It was cast into the fire, and at once took the colour of fire, but without losing its form or substance. When the fire had burned out, the towel was found to be intact. It must have been made of asbestos. The learned Professors Gildemeister and Von Sybel of Bonn in 1844 piously and bravely suggested that the "Holy Coat" of Trier should be subjected to a similar test by the ecclesiastical authorities as a canonical method for the removal of doubt from the minds of the faithful. It was early in the twelfth century that the famous Abbot Guibert of Nogent complained of the wholesale manufacture of spurious relics and spurious saints. He gave a series of examples from his own neighbourhood and his own experience. A young man in a village near Beauvais, he said, had been canonized simply because he died on Good Friday; the neighbouring peasants made pilgrimages to his grave, and offered candles and *ex voto* gifts in return for his intercession. "Through such lies

and rogueries," said he, "purses are emptied to the very bottom. In towns and villages new saints are daily proclaimed, and the clergy hold their tongues." Guibert charged them with being afraid to defy public opinion, especially that of the old women who railed at them as irreligious if they ventured to contradict the local delusions. The worst of the clergy were tempted to trade upon the superstition of the faithful, and Guibert tells of one priest, "the preacher of a famous church, who exhibited a piece of bread which the Lord Christ had chewed with His own teeth." Guibert knew for a fact that one head of St. John the Baptist was to be seen at Constantinople, and another head of the same saint at St. Jean d'Angeli. He did not know, what is also true, that a reputed head of the Baptist was preserved in other places.

It was in this period of delusion and pious roguery, the beginning of the twelfth century, that "der heilige Rock," the Holy Coat of Christ without seam, was first declared to be in the possession of the Church of Trier. There was a common legend afloat in Europe in the twelfth century that a Christian Empress had brought or sent the seamless coat of our Blessed Lord from Jerusalem to Western Europe. According to the German variation, the Empress was Helena, who gave the precious relic to the Church of Trier. According to the French variation of the legend, the Empress was Irene, and she sent the Holy Coat as a present to the Emperor Charles the Great, who gave it to the Church of Argenteuil in France, where "la Sainte Robe sans couture de Notre Seigneur Jesu Christ" remains to this day, and is contended for by local patriotism as the actual tunic mentioned by the historians, Gregory of Tours and Fredegar. A romantic apologetic history of this French "Holy Coat" was published in the seventeenth century by Dom Gabriel Gerberon. The earliest documentary evidence of the existence of such a relic in Argenteuil occurs in the end of the twelfth century. The monastic church of Argenteuil, to which the French "Holy Coat" is reputed to have been originally given by Charles the Great, was plundered and burnt to the ground by the Normans in 845 or 846. Hence to account for the presence of the relic in the same place three hundred years later, it was necessary to invent the legend that the nuns of Argenteuil had time before their escape to have the French "Holy Coat" cemented up in one of the walls. The relic was discovered in

this wall in the year 1150. The invention of the Holy Coat, as its historian says, was "the foundation of the rapid prosperity of Argenteuil. Pilgrims of every age, of every class in life, of both sexes, crowded to the place to venerate the sacred coat, and the monastery was enriched with donations and pious foundations." The authenticity of the French "Holy Coat" was vindicated by numerous miracles. In 1567 the monastery was again plundered and set on fire, not by the Normans, but by a Huguenot regiment. At this point the historians differ as to the fate of the relic. Collin de Plancy says that the impious Calvinist soldiery burned "cette robe sans couture," which we can readily believe, for the French Puritans doubtless regarded it as a "monument of superstition and idolatry," which the Lord required them to destroy. Nevertheless, the French "Holy Coat" appeared again in the beginning of our century. The Bishop of Versailles in 1804, at the order of the Cardinal Legate, instituted a formal examination of the genuineness of a much damaged "Holy Coat" which was dug up in the garden of the presbytery of Argenteuil, where it had been buried by the parish priest. The report was satisfactory. Pieces had been cut off for the use of pious persons during the long interval of the disappearance of the relic between the Reformation and Revolution. Several of these were collected. The old French "Fraternity of the Holy Seamless Coat" was reconstituted: the old "Litanies of the Holy Coat" were reprinted; medals were coined, and pictures published to quicken devotion to the "Holy Coat" in France. It was the suggestion of the mediæval Guibert, who could not forecast the ultimate political and ecclesiastical results, that every reputed local relic, like every reputed local saint, should not be revered as authentic until confirmation of its claims had been pronounced by the "Church of Rome," which came in time to mean, not the whole social body of the Roman Church, but simply the individual Roman Pope. In the year 1843 this much-desired apostolic confirmation of the genuineness of the French "Holy Coat," the most dangerous competitor of the German "Holy Coat" at Trier, was obtained from Pope Gregory XVI. He raised the altar of the parish church of Argenteuil, as "the altar of the Vestment, or Tunic of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is there deposited," to the dignity of a "privileged altar." We believe that several of our English Vaticanists, principally 'verts from the English Church, intend to go on pil-

grimag
Trier.
sceptic
seamle
gratefu
tion t
Pope i
Roman
epoch
tor of
Roman
Cliffor
his "H
as the
Christ
church
Tho
in the
"Holy
Papal
X. ag
Popes
to a C
can Co
dividu
social
becom
There
this ca
X. iss
Cath
Empr
seamle
be pla
Holy
Trier,
Profes
Trier
op Ar
proof
"Hol
menta
Bonn
Sybel,
holy
which
vered
ble fo
more
King
the F
is tru
eviden
centu
of th
one o
XVI.
or of
Th
Pope
form

grimage to the German "Holy Coat" at Trier. If any one amongst them should be sceptical as to its being the only authentic seamless coat of the Saviour, he may be grateful to us for giving him the information that he can cite the authority of a Pope in justification of his doubts. Nay, a Roman Catholic of the old Vicar-apostolic epoch of English Romanism, and an ancestor of one of the present Bishops of the Roman Nonconformists in England, Lord Clifford, in the same year, 1843, published his "Brief Account of the Relic venerated as the Seamless Tunic of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is preserved in the parish church of Argenteuil."

Those Romanists who prefer to believe in the rival and more successful German "Holy Coat" at Trier can also appeal to Papal authority. They can cite Pope Leo X. against Pope Gregory XVI. When Popes differ, who shall decide? To appeal to a Council against a Pope, since the Vatican Council definitively substantiated the individual person of the Roman Bishop for the social entirety of the Catholic Church, has become "treason" for the Roman Catholic. There is no question as to the difference in this case. On February 1, 1514, Pope Leo X. issued a Bull in which he said that the Cathedral Church of Trier was built by the Empress Helena, and that she caused the seamless coat of our Lord Jesus Christ to be placed in it. In "The History of the Holy Coat in the Cathedral Church of Trier," which was published by Dr. Marx, Professor at the Episcopal Seminary of Trier in 1844, with the approbation of Bishop Arnoldi, the bull of Leo X. is cited as a proof of the authenticity of the German "Holy Coat." Although there is documentary evidence, according to the two Bonn Professors, Gildemeister and Von Sybel, of the existence of no less than forty holy seamless coats of the Saviour, each of which in its time and place has been revered as the only genuine one, it is impossible for the simple Christian to believe that more than one of these can be genuine. King Edward the Confessor gave a part of the Holy Coat to Westminster Abbey. It is true that "Rome has spoken," but it is evident, since the Pope of the nineteenth century has virtually contradicted the Pope of the sixteenth century, that the voice of one or of the other, of Leo X. or Gregory XVI., cannot possibly be the voice of truth, or of Him Who is the Truth.

The London daily evening organ of the Pope and the Salvationist General has informed the world that "the Cathedral

fathers at Trier invited a commission of connoisseurs to pronounce upon the garment," and that "an eminent German archaeologist who was on this committee declared that part of the garment belonged to the dim and distant period when Caesar Augustus ruled over the Roman Empire." The same pretence of satisfying doubts by submitting the relic to the examination of experts was gone through in 1844. But the experts were bound to a foregone conclusion. Unprejudiced archaeologists who examined the Holy Seamless Coat of Trier discovered that it was very perceptibly seamed, and that figures of animals were discernible on it. Cordel, the Vicar general of the diocese of Trier, at the exhuming of the Holy Coat in 1810, said that "the head of an animal was discovered on it," apparently a peacock, and he gave expression to the naive wish "that fewer persons had been present, or else that the Holy Coat had not been exhibited in their presence." The two able historians and archaeologists whom we have cited have produced exhaustive and incontrovertible evidence that the form, the colour, the structure, and the material of the woollen "Holy Coat" at Trier, apart from the total defect of historical testimony earlier than the twelfth century, all go to prove that it cannot possibly be the seamless coat worn by our Blessed Lord.

We began by referring to the difference in intellectual perception of the ignorant and the educated members of the Church. The peasant-class, which always supplies the greatest contingent of pilgrims, is inclined to attribute personality to the objects of its veneration. Eye-witnesses and ear-witnesses affirmed in 1844, in the German newspapers (we can give name and date if necessary), that the poor pilgrims cried out as they knelt before the relic, "Heiliger Rock, zu dir Komme ich! Heiliger Rock, dich bete ich an! Heiliger Rock, bitte für mich!" (Holy Coat, I come to thee! Holy Coat, I pray to thee! Holy Coat, pray for me.)

THE HOLY COAT.

From *The New York Freeman's Journal* (R. C.), August 29, 1891.

BERLIN, Aug. 20.—The Holy Coat was exposed to view this morning in the Cathedral at Treves. Two Knights of Malta, in full costume, with drawn swords in their hands, stood on each side of the shrine inclosing the Holy Coat case, which was sur-

rounded by tall lighted candles in handsome candlesticks, and surmounted by a large gold cross.

There was an impressive scene in the sanctuary. Over 100 priests assisted in the Pontifical High Mass which followed the unveiling of the coat. The Cathedral was richly decorated for the occasion, and was packed to the doors with people. The white surplices of the choir, the gorgeous vestments of the priests, the scarlet uniforms of the Knights of Malta, the countless lights flickering in every nook and corner, the prismatic rays filtering through the old windows, the strange congregation, composed of people of many nations and all walks of life, formed a picture not often seen.

Bishop Korum, in his address to the assembled multitude, earnestly urged the faithful to unite in venerating the garment from which power and virtue proceeds. The nave of the Cathedral was then cleared so as to enable the municipal authorities and the parochial societies to march up to the shrine of the Holy Coat and venerate that relic.

The scene in the Cathedral was a motley one. English tourists in light-tweed suits, and Prussian officers in uniform, stubbornly refusing to kneel before the relic, and a bourgeois citizen in evening dress, were prominent in the crowd. The service, with the monotonous Gregorian chants, and the administration of the Eucharist to representative ecclesiastics, seemed of the character of a mediæval ceremony. The unveiling of the relic evidently made a deep devotional impression on the crowd of worshippers. Many were overpowered by their feelings. Several women fainted. There was a general movement of the crowd, prompted by curiosity as well as religious fervor.

The procession past the shrine of the pilgrims, most of whom handed a rosary or crucifix to attendant priests, for contact with the relic, was accompanied by a low hum of paternosters and aves. Among the pilgrims are aged cripples and sufferers from almost every complaint. Outside the Cathedral there was a busy scene, to which processions with banners and music, throngs of visitors and vendors of photographs, rosaries and images, who had a thriving trade, all contributed.

There were some scenes of disorder, owing to somewhat violent attempts made to gain early access to the Cathedral.

Treves is overflowing with pilgrims and with visitors whose curiosity alone has been

excited. The streets are filled with processions of all descriptions, and sacred banners, torches and lighted candles are to be seen on all sides.

During the whole time the Holy Coat is on exhibition about twenty excursion trains a day will arrive at Treves, a very great number for a Continental city, and a large temporary railroad station has been built for the pilgrims. In order that the town may not be overcrowded, the different bands of pilgrims, led by their priests, will only be permitted to remain one night in town. Arriving, say, in the evening, they will march next morning in procession to the Cathedral, and must leave town the same evening in order to make way for other religious bodies.

Some idea of the number of people at Treves and of the accommodation provided for them may be had from the fact that nearly 500 citizens of Treves sent in petitions to the municipal authorities for licenses to keep inns and other public houses during the exhibition of the Holy Coat. In addition, nearly every private householder has made arrangements for receiving visitors during the six weeks of the exhibition. Extra horse-car lines have been laid, and a market will be held every day.

Pictures of the Holy Coat are to be seen not only in every shop window in Treves, but in nearly every shop window of this city, and there are millions of these representations in all sizes and shapes, on handkerchiefs, on paper, on earthenware, on wood and on metal, which are being sold everywhere. The photographs are merely reproductions of drawings of the Holy Coat, published in illustrated papers in 1844, and there are also reproductions of medals of that time.

Much comment has been caused by the remarks of Bishop Korum in his opening address to-day, when he referred pointedly to the spiritual significance of the Holy Coat as being a seamless vesture and as being a symbol of the unity of the Catholic Church. There were many Roman Catholic members of the Reichstag present, and it is said that the Bishop particularly, and in a manner not to be mistaken, addressed his remarks to these members.

The Holy Coat is distinctly visible in the body of the Cathedral, and is much more plainly seen than upon the former occasion of its exhibition. The old silken covering, being almost entirely worn away, appeared to-day to be of a brownish-yellow color.

The first solemn exhibition of the Holy Coat took place in 1196, when it was placed

under t
1511, w
gently v
done in
time pil
the pil
1531, 1
was als

Town
tury, w
invaded
hidden
There,
allowe
coat w
War.
1765 i
few ye
the in
invade

At
tion c
I. per
mirac
Yet t
dol, a
patien
alone
Th
and
porte
date
took
great
of th

J

BY T

From

T
the
frie
wel
ciat
cha
T
app
the
to
ogr
for
Ho
S
wr

under the new altar. There it rested until 1511, when the Emperor Maximilian I. urgently wished it to be exhibited, which was done in that year. Pope Leo X. about this time promised indulgence to all who made the pilgrimage to Treves. In the years 1531, 1545, 1553, 1585, 1594 and 1635 it was also shown.

Toward the end of the seventeenth century, when the French, under Louis XIV., invaded Germany, the precious relic was hidden in the fortress of Ehrenbreitstein. There, in 1725, the Elector of Cologne was allowed to see it. In Ehrenbreitstein the coat was kept until after the Seven Years' War. After the last exhibition there in 1765 it was brought back to Treves, but a few years later it had to be removed into the interior of Germany when Napoleon I. invaded the country.

At last, in 1810, another solemn exhibition could take place in Treves. Napoleon I. permitted it, but he expressly forbade miracles to be performed on this occasion. Yet the report of the Vicar-General, Cordol, about the exhibition says that gouty patients who were wheeled up walked away alone.

The rulers of 1844 were more tolerant, and therefore numerous miracles were reported. The Treves newspapers of that date are full of accounts of miracles which took place at the exhibition of 1844. The greatest sensation was caused by the healing of the young Countess of Droste-Vischering.

JOHN HENRY HOPKINS, D.D.

BY THE RIGHT REV. HUGH MILLER THOMPSON, D.D., BISHOP OF MISSISSIPPI.

From *The Churchman* (Epis.), New York, September 5, 1891.

THIS evening *The Churchman* brings me the announcement of the death of my friend, John Henry Hopkins, and some well-considered words of its own in appreciation of his work, his influence, and his character.

The American Church is singularly unappreciative, even blind, one might say, to the power of her own periodical press, and to the work of its editors. She has no recognition ordinarily, no rewards certainly, for men who make, as you well say in Dr. Hopkins's case, eras in her history.

She seems to have a suspicion of men who write weekly for print instead of pulpit,

who speak to an audience of twenty-five thousand thinkers, instead of to one of five hundred who do not think.

Nevertheless, she has produced two great editors, Dr. Seabury of *The Churchman*, Dr. Hopkins of the *Church Journal*, who each have created eras, who each have had more power in guiding her opinion and leading her steps, as far as human judgment can see, than any half dozen of her bishops or General Conventions.

The power is a tremendous one, and in both cases it was wielded (an irresponsible power, too, except to God and conscience) on high lines of duty, obligation, and Christian self-abnegation.

I knew personally both the men, honored and loved them both. The first only in his age, of course, and as I met him in his cloistered retirement, among his books in the General Seminary, where his successor should also have thought and written in the fallow leisure of his life.

Dr. Hopkins, I knew from the beginning. We were deacons together and I half-converted to his early fad of "perpetual deaconship" for example's sake!

I remember well the stimulus the *Church Journal* was to myself and others of my time—so long ago now!—and how delighted I was to meet the maker of it in the little dingy office in Cedar street.

He helped me, in sore need in my work, generously, and with a sort of boyish abandon. Indeed, he had the first characteristic of genius, he was a boy all the days of his life—fresh, unsophisticated, unworldly.

He preached the sermon at the consecration of the church his influence so largely helped me to build. He was godfather to my eldest son, at the first baptism had there. Went from New York to Wisconsin to do this kindness.

It came to us, in God's guiding of our lives, to stand opposed in crises of the Church's history. The friendship, the affection, were never touched. I wrote him once, at such a time, telling him I should in conscience oppose his views with all my power, but I wanted him to understand that nothing of that sort could change the deep regard I held for John Henry Hopkins.

His reply was characteristic: "You and I are too accustomed to square fighting to think the less of each other for a fair blow." He always fought with his visor up, a knightly opponent. There was no malice, no bitterness. Indeed, instead, a cheery boyish enjoyment of the intellectual fray.

Except Washburn, I never knew a man so incapable of understanding how an hon-

est attack on his opinions could be construed into anything personal.

And now he is gone! And I cannot let his going pass without my humble tribute to a man dear to me, a friend to whom personally I owe much of what I have myself thought or said that may be of any worth, to a gentle soul, much misunderstood, as men of genius so often are, to a thinker who has left his mark for all time on the Church of his baptism, and to a Christian knight fallen with his armor on.

From *The Living Church* (Epis.), Chicago, August 29, 1891.

THE decease of the Rev. John Henry Hopkins, S.T.D., occurred on the evening of August 13th, at the residence of Dr. E. D. Ferguson, of Troy, N. Y., under whose friendly and professional care, Dr. Hopkins, as a cherished guest, passed most of the last years of his life. Born in 1820, in Pittsburgh, Pa., graduated at the University of Vermont in 1839, and from the General Theological Seminary in 1850, Dr. Hopkins has been identified with the theology and liturgic development of the Church from the time of the Cary ordination, down to the anti-climacteric elevation of Dr. Brooks to the bishopric of Massachusetts. And here it should be said, parenthetically, was struck the first dissonant note in his entire ecclesiastical career, and this may be charitably attributed to the faltering, disordered judgment of a dying man.

From the outset, he became a Catholic, sincere, intrepid, aggressive, and thoroughly equipped for warfare, defensive and offensive; and withal, clothed upon with the rare grace of a fervent and abiding charity, which never chilled or failed in the crisis of most desperate controversies. His attitude was never apologetic or equivocal. *Sans peur sans reproche* he dealt the fiercest blows, and grappled with foemen of Catholic faith, wherever they were to be encountered, whether within the fold, or among the denominations, or the Romanists, without personal animosities, guiltless of un-knightly behaviour, and never discomfited. He was a perfect controversialist, pushed to the front under emergencies that seized and dominated him from the outset. Thus he became a journalist, founding *The Church Journal* and conducting it for fifteen years, with such energy, signal ability, and devotion in the promulgation of Catholic Faith and Apostolic order, that he became their

recognized champion throughout the American press; and to this day his reputation shines out chiefest and foremost among our defenders of the Faith.

Upon others, however, will devolve with greater fitness, due memorial survey of his valiant services for the furtherance and the maturity of the young American Church; as first to discuss in *The Church Journal*, and elsewhere, the introduction of the cathedral and see system; the subdivision and multiplication of dioceses; the sending forth of a pioneer episcopate for the opening up of new jurisdictions; a resuscitation of the Catholic theology of the Incarnation, with the ancient eucharistic worship of Catholic Christendom; the establishment of sisterhoods and brotherhoods under the ancient discipline for the furtherance of every good word and work; all this, and much more.

It is for us the rather to dwell upon his rare and gracious accomplishments, as they were lovingly devoted to the service of the Church. It will be generally conceded that in this relation he lived among us without a rival. His versatility was astonishing while his mastery was thorough, and at times brilliant. One of the original projectors and members of the old Ecclesiological Society, he early became a recognized authority through the entire range of its inquiries,—as to Gothic art in all its periods and phases and symbolism; sanctuary and chancel furnishings and adornments; sacred utensils and vessels, stained glass, interior decorations, mortuary and memorial art, and all the rest.

He was skilled in the arts of design; was more than an amateur painter in oils; with his brush, sharing the pious toils of his father, the Bishop, in more than one church and sanctuary. He was a curious and dainty master of poetic art, producing not a few carols and hymns which have promise of long life; while his knowledge in ecclesiastical music, especially in its earlier periods and schools, was recondite, and turned to excellent account, in the furtherance of Plain Song and Gregorian uses. The writer distinctly recalls the time when he had the privilege of introducing to the young seminarian "Helmore's (Plain Song) Psalter Noted," and the enthusiastic delight it elicited, an event more than once adverted to by the Doctor in after years, as his initiation into the fellowship of the true ecclesiastical school of liturgic music.

It was not alone his quick, keen intelligence in these multiplied arts of beauty;

since he them in constant he was a the Beau in eccles guistic a many tr works, a as well as of Bisho followed publicat sketch c most br certainly not as y

No on vitality its shar with th turn tr yet sub din. I he knew tions in fallible, vulnera defence trained while i the m sialists. humor which of the ways a even in insolent was sp no rest had gr ing aw diction and v the sa

As a contin until The C his u theolo deed, Thom contri manis

But the d charit improv

since he at once set them at work,—placed them in current circulation throughout his constantly widening circle of influence, for he was a born propagandist of "The True, the Beautiful, and the Good," as expressed in ecclesiastical life and work. His linguistic acquirements were richly varied, and many translations of important papers and works, attest his acquaintance with modern as well as the classic languages. His "Life" of Bishop Hopkins is his *magnum opus*, followed by his editorial co-operation in the publication of the works and biographical sketch of Dr. Milo Mahan. Perhaps his most brilliant successes were editorial, and certainly as a journalist the Church has not as yet produced his peer.

No one can forget the singular energy and vitality of his English, at once Saxon, in its sharp, incisive directness; yet suffused with the finest graces of scholarship, in turn trenchant as the sword of Richard, yet subtle and deadly as scimitar of Saladin. He was almost fiercely in earnest: he knew exhaustively the bearings of questions in controversy: his memory was infallible, and so fertile and ready that no vulnerable point, or expedient of attack or defence escaped him. So his idiom became trained to its utmost possible efficiency, while intrepidity and adroitness made him the most formidable of recent controversialists. Moreover, there was the cheery humor of an imperturbable good temper, which never failed him; as on the platform of the Church Congress, where he was always among the most welcome in debate, or even in that most fierce conflict with the insolent Monsignor Capel. His persistence was splendid. He gave us no quarter and no rest in New York until its two dioceses had grown into five; and he was hammering away at some of these unwieldy jurisdictions for further division, when hand and voice were stayed by death. It was the same thing in Pennsylvania.

As a literary worker he was indefatigable, continuing at his self-appointed tasks, even until the end. His later contributions to *The Church Review*, quarterly, illustrate his unfailing ability and resources, as a theologian and defender of the Faith. Indeed, his latest volume, published by Mr. Thomas Whittaker, is one of the strongest contributions to our controversy with Romanism.

But who shall attempt to memorialize the depths and tenderness of his Christian charity, and his unostentatious charities, impoverishing himself his life long for the

help and comfort of others! There are many to-day who must recall, with bitter sorrow, the departed priest who made haste to succor and vindicate the unfortunate and imperilled. In this Christ-like work he was busy in season and out of season. And so he lived and toiled, literally taking no thought of the morrow, for himself, until old age overtook him with shattered strength and worldly substance so lovingly dispensed, that the prosperous and self-seeking, who had taken the best of care for their own advancement and worldly gains, are half tempted to set him down as an improvident dreamer and an unpractical idealist.

That most unkindest cut of all, was the discomfiture that befell him, so near the close of his days, in the house of his lifelong "friends," who shut the door of a limited professorship in the General Theological Seminary—and for which he was conspicuously qualified—squarely in his face. But no word of complaint is on record, as crossing his lips. While those who knew and loved him best, must agree that "these things are unequal," and cry out in their grief, "Alas! my brother!" they certainly will find joy in assurance of that exceeding recompense of reward in waiting for this good and faithful servant, now entered into rest with his Lord. Living without ecclesiastical preferment, and the distinction and emoluments that reward the ambitious and fortunate, no single, priestly life is interwoven more closely with all that is fairest and strongest in the Church life of this day, or has contributed more richly and lovingly for their growth and perpetuity. May he rest in peace, and perpetual light shine upon him!

PAROCHIAL VS. PUBLIC SCHOOLS —A SIGNIFICANT INCIDENT.

BY ALBERT SHAW, PH.D.

From *The Christian Union* (Undenomin.), New York, September 12, 1891.

So much has been said and written of late concerning the growth of Catholic parochial schools in the Northwest, and their rivalry with the public schools, that very widespread interest can but attach to a recent step in the opposite direction—one that seems to possess unusual significance. At Faribault, Minn., the large Catholic schools of the Immaculate Conception parish have just been transferred to the local

Board of Education without any conditions or reservations; and the buildings were thrown open on Monday, August 31, for children of all creeds and races, under the direction of the public school authorities. The following letter, sent by the Rev. James J. Conry to the Board of Education, is the sole written instrument of transfer:

FARIBAULT, August 26, 1891.

To the Board of Education of the City of Faribault:

GENTLEMEN—I have been informed by a member of your Board that you wished me to state definitely and in writing the proposition I submitted to you on the evening of the 22d inst., and to which you gave courteous attention. As an American interested in obtaining for the future citizens of the Republic the greatest advantages consistent with the common good, I beg leave to comply with your request, and again submit (this time in writing) the proposition submitted on the evening of August 22, 1891, repeating, with your permission, a few of the reasons at that time submitted therefor, viz.:

That the children at present enrolled in the schools of the Immaculate Conception parish may receive the benefits that result from an American training in all that the term implies.

That these children may thus receive in their civic training a perfect preparation for the duties and responsibilities of American citizenship, thereby enhancing the renown of this city among its sister cities of the commonwealth as a great educational center; and that our custodians of the public schools may receive from State and county appropriations that additional per capita tax which the commonwealth wishes them to receive and which at present they fail to receive because of the maintenance of separate schools.

I herewith subjoin the proposition: In consideration of one dollar (\$1.00), I agree to place under the management and control of the Board of Education of the city of Faribault, the school building, and all its equipments, at present known as the parish school of the Immaculate Conception Church, with the grounds upon which the school building is located, the same to be used by said Board for educational purposes under such conditions as that Board may determine to be for the best interests of all concerned.

Confidently intrusting the matter, gentlemen, to your discretion and judgment, I remain,

Respectfully yours,

JAMES J. CONRY.

Father Conry's proposition was very fully discussed in all its bearings in two meetings of the Board of Education, and was unanimously adopted. There are, therefore, no longer any parochial schools in Faribault.

The town of Faribault is one of the most beautiful in the entire Northwest, and it is renowned as an educational center. Upon the slopes of the long east hill that overlooks the town in the valley is the series of institutions that have been built up as the "Seabury Mission," under Bishop Whipple's oversight—the famous Shattuck

School, the Seabury Divinity School, and St. Mary's Hall. There also are the State institutions for the care and training of the deaf and dumb, the blind, and the feeble-minded. Faribault has a population of from seven to eight thousand, and it has the motley nationality complexion that one usually finds in the Northwestern towns. It has its strong contingents of Scandinavians, Germans, French-Canadians, and Bohemians. It has three Catholic churches, in charge respectively of a French, a German, and an American priest. Father Conry ministers to the American and Irish Catholics. He is himself Wisconsin-born, of Irish parentage. He is intensely American in his feelings and sympathies, and has somewhat recently gone to Faribault from St. Paul, where he was closely under the influence of Archbishop Ireland. However much his colleague the German priest at Faribault may have sympathized with his complete surrender to the public schools, it is likely that his action had the tacit approval of his French colleague, who is known to be a man of progressive views and American sentiments. It happened that the Catholic schools of Faribault were entirely grouped in one large building, and were under Father Conry's exclusive control; so that he was not obliged to defer to the foreign-speaking priests of the vicinity. His closing the parish schools practically compels the children of all nationalities to attend the public schools.

It should be observed that the School Board does not accept the parochial schools as such. The children who have heretofore attended them, from all parts of town, must now take their places among the other children of their immediate localities in the ward schools. Besides a central school which includes the high school, the public system of Faribault embraces six ward schools. The total number of pupils in the public schools last year approached 1,300; while there were several hundred in the Catholic parish school. The building now simply becomes available as an additional member of the public system, and its former character totally disappears. Since the Catholic children must be scattered throughout the school-rooms of eight buildings, it becomes manifestly impossible to retain the former Catholic teachers as instructors of Catholic youth. All such considerations were fully discussed, and perfectly understood by Father Conry.

Faribault has an admirable system of public schools, which for a number of years

has been Professor University their inst tional cha which pe Father Co Also, and he recogni can publi loyal and

Evident schools w ligious, that it is educate C to keep th heathful surely pro sands of the Chur that the opened w portion of of the Lo and unsee jection.

There this step of Archb patriotic the foreig French, schools th and other complete system as ous to se him a fai of the p He must, izing the

There the title and it wil lic Chur some fut But the that the clergy, w plan of in must sup after hav the local Such step trace. A prove cor must, th markable yet more

has been under the superintendence of Professor Willis West, a graduate of the University of Minnesota. Unquestionably their instruction and their general educational character is very far superior to that which pertained to the parish schools. Father Conry frankly recognized this fact. Also, and chiefly, as his letter fully implies, he recognizes the importance of the American public schools as the true nurseries of loyal and broad American citizenship.

Evidently he has no fear that the public schools will make Catholic children irreligious. He perceives, on the contrary, that it is the jealous and narrow attempt to educate Catholic children separately, and to keep them from contact with normal and healthful American influences, that most surely provokes a reaction and drives thousands of young people wholly away from the Church. Father Conry is fully aware that the public schools of Faribault are opened with the reading of a Psalm or brief portion of Scripture and with the recitation of the Lord's Prayer. But to such simple and unsectarian practice he makes no objection.

There can be no doubt whatever that this step has been taken with the sanction of Archbishop Ireland. That wise and patriotic prelate has an utter abhorrence of the foreignizing tendencies of the German, French, Polish, and Bohemian parish schools that are so numerous in Wisconsin and other Western States. He is in almost complete sympathy with the public school system as it stands, and is earnestly desirous to secure, upon what would seem to him a fair and honorable basis, a merging of the parochial into the public system. He must, therefore, be considered as authorizing the Faribault experiment.

There has been, of course, no transfer of the title of the Faribault school property; and it will be within the power of the Catholic Church to reopen separate schools at some future time in the existing building. But the Catholic laity of Faribault, now that the concession has been made by the clergy, will never willingly return to the plan of inferior Church schools, which they must support out of their private means, after having paid their share of taxes into the local and the State public school funds. Such steps once taken are not easy to retrace. And such examples are likely to prove contagious. The Faribault incident must, then, be regarded not only as remarkable in itself, but also as significant of yet more important things to come.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF JULIUS KOESTLIN, AUTHOR OF THE LIFE OF LUTHER.

BY J. H. W. STUCKENBERG, D.D., BERLIN.

From *The Lutheran Observer* (General Synod, Lutheran), Philadelphia, August 28, 1891.

DR. JULIUS KOESTLIN, professor of systematic theology in Halle, is now 65 years old. He was requested to furnish his autobiography for the series of *German Thinkers*, and his valuable contribution has just appeared. Koestlin has written on various theological subjects but is best known through his works on Luther. A large part of his life has been devoted to the study of Luther and the Reformation, and in this department he is, no doubt, the first living authority in the world. His work on the Life and Writings of Luther appeared in two volumes in 1875, and the third edition in 1883, the Luther year. Luther's Life in one volume, with illustrations, was published in 1882; the seventh edition in 1889. A still smaller biography for youth appeared in 1883; and within a year the twenty-second edition was published. Besides various addresses on the Reformer, he also wrote a defence of him against the attacks of Janssen, the ultramontane historian, who did his utmost to degrade Luther and the Reformation. Besides the article Luther in Herzog's Encyclopædia, he also published a work on Luther's Theology, and another on Luther's doctrine of the Church, not to name other writings bearing on similar subjects.

Koestlin's attention was directed to Luther's writings while still a youth for the sake of their style. When he entered the University of Tübingen, Professor Beck advised him to read Luther for the sake of his religious influence. Koestlin thinks it strange that this advice should come from Beck, regarded as heterodox by Lutherans, "and he was heterodox," he adds. Yet he remembers no other teacher in his whole life who referred him to the study of Luther's works for the sake of their religious influence. Indeed, Koestlin had to learn that many glory in being Lutherans who care far more for their fixed and finished views than for the spirit and works of the Reformer. Thus in his work on Luther's Theology he brought out much that was new; but the new points were not further developed and did not even excite comment. The author adds: "A peculiar sign of those times, in which so many

wanted to be regarded as true Lutherans and strove to appear interested in Luther's doctrine."

The immense labor devoted to the large Luther biography was rewarded by the reception given the work. No scholar arose to dispute his conception of the Reformer, and the work itself became the inspiration for renewed study of the great revival of the sixteenth century and for new works on the subject. An historical prize given once in ten years was shared by Koestlin for his book with Ranke, the greatest historian of the age. The Prussian government also put Koestlin on a committee to superintend the publication of a critical edition of all the works of Luther.

Koestlin has not only made a study of Luther and the Reformation as no other theologian, but he is also an avowed Lutheran. This term is not used in the same sense by those who make the name a boast and the means of parade: but he uses it with a full knowledge of its import and on account of the valuable treasures restored by the Reformer. We therefore turn with peculiar interest to his views of matters pertaining to Lutheranism.

He visited Scotland while a student for the purpose of studying its religious condition. Scotch Presbyterianism had much that was inspiring, nevertheless he found it too narrow, too legal. Yet he discovered genuine catholicity there, and a great admiration for Luther. When he told the Scotch pastors that he came from Württemberg (his home then being in Stuttgart), they understood him to mean Wittenberg, and would at once exclaim: "Ah, the town of Luther!" He was struck with the fact that at the great Luther celebration at Wittenberg, in 1883, there were representatives of the Scotch and Irish Presbyterian churches to join in the Jubilee. But the Anglican church was not only not represented, but, he says, there were persons in that church who proposed a counter-demonstration. It is well-known that the High-church party rejects the terms Evangelical and Protestant, and glories in the name Catholic, and that from its midst are heard denunciations of Luther and the Reformation which are worthy of the ultramontanes. This party rejects the place which Luther gave the sermon in worship, and substitutes for it the Prayer Book and Romish practices.

After his extensive journeys for religious study in Scotland, Ireland, England, Germany, and Switzerland, he became *Repetent*, or tutor, in Tübingen. He says

that then he felt the need of forming a clear conception of the Evangelical and Lutheran view of the church. "I became absorbed by Luther's own doctrine. I found it neither so difficult nor so unsettled as I had heretofore heard from others, nor yet the same as the teaching of the older and newer dogmaticians; neither did I find it in harmony with the views prevailing among churchmen of the present, who on the one hand expect too much from liturgical formulas, and on the other look for a special blessing from the episcopal form of government."

From Tübingen he went to Göttingen as professor of theology and second university preacher. Professor Schoeberlein, greatly intent on developing liturgies, was called to the university at the same time. From the meagre liturgical services of Württemberg Koestlin was now introduced to the much more elaborate forms of worship prevalent in the kingdom of Hanover. But efforts were inaugurated to make the liturgy more elaborate. This Koestlin vigorously opposed. He says: "It may be a defect arising from my antecedents and churchly training, but although I have learned more and more to prize this side of divine service, I never yet have acquired enough taste and enthusiasm for it. But I was firmly convinced, and am still, that for the quickening of the congregation the most beautiful hymns and responses that are put into the mouths of the people, are less effective than the impulses given them to be active in works of Christian love, as inner missions and the like, and to take part in all the management and government of the church. As a student of Luther I also believe it my duty to utter a warning, in my small book on Luther's Doctrine of the Church, against the dangerous modern overestimate of those (liturgical) elements. At least it seemed to me that the forms of the various churches which had become historic should be treated with the greatest consideration, and ought not be changed without urgent reason, and especially not without the consent of those participating in the service." When Schoeberlein, therefore, wanted to make the liturgy more elaborate, Koestlin answered "No."

He was decidedly opposed to the use of all constraint respecting the worship of congregations. From Göttingen he went as professor to Breslau. While there, it became his duty to visit a congregation to induce them to accept a new hymn book. The congregation declined doing so; and he declared publicly and officially that a

congrega
hymn bo
respectin
to the
doubts a
with ma
church.
was a f
state ch
the free

Koest
to the l
which l
study.
the sepa
he could
by the c
versions
Luther
numerou
their po
Lutheran

After
student
among
that tim
promoti
anism"
called "
then ad
been pu
Lutheran
Koestlin
lin espe
tians, a
a blind
vain lo
externa
Christia
and als
many p
ner, on
remark
appeal
of the
count
yoursel
In Goss
for del
orthodo

Koes
faith.
inner c
divine
commu
With
neither
which
its vali
found
which

congregation cannot be forced to change its hymn book. And this declaration he made respecting a congregation which belonged to the state church. He also had serious doubts about the introduction of two books, with many hymns alike, into the same church. His mission to the congregation was a failure, and the authorities of the state church yielded the point in favor of the freedom of the congregation.

Koestlin repeatedly shows his antipathy to the high church Lutheran tendencies, which he had frequent opportunities to study. At Breslau he came in contact with the separatistic Lutheran movement. This he could not favor, just as he felt repelled by the coldness of rationalism and the perversions of ultramontaniam. He knew Luther too well to be carried along by the numerous modern perversions which seek their power and glory in the abuse of the Lutheran name.

After visiting Great Britain, while yet a student, he came to Berlin. Here he met, among others, the devout Gossner. At that time an especial effort was made for the promotion of what is called "New Lutheranism" in Germany, while in America it is called "Old Lutheranism." The extremes then advocated (it was in 1850) have since been pushed aside by a deeper and healthier Lutheran spirit. But to the statements of Koestlin, "It was at a time when in Berlin especially, even among honest Christians, a sickly union of politics and religion, a blind return to old dogmatic forms, a vain longing for high churchism and for external authority, threatened evangelical Christianity with the most serious dangers, and also found pernicious expression in many pulpits." In opposition to this, Gossner, on New Year's day, 1850, basing his remarks on Lamentations iii. 9, made this appeal to his hearers: "Do not complain of the democrats, do not murmur on account of revolutionists, but complain of yourselves and of the state of your heart!" In Gossner's prayer was included a petition for deliverance from a churchliness and an orthodoxy behind which lurks the devil.

Koestlin earnestly advocates a living faith. He regards Christian faith as an inner experience, a response of the soul to divine influence. Genuine faith leads to communion with God through Christ. With this view of faith he could agree neither with rationalism nor with a faith which needs external human authority for its validity. During his stay at Breslau he found a rationalism prevalent in Silesia which fails to recognize the proper founda-

tions of Christian faith. He also found there a churchly orthodoxy which had inner warmth, but which also rejected, by means of superficial apologetics, the just demands of criticism, and "boasted of a faithful adherence to the Lutheran confession, without a thorough knowledge of Luther."

The author is still in full vigor, and much may yet be expected from his earnest labors. He combines heart with intellect, theology with religion, a critical with a devout spirit, a scientific mind with a sincere love for the practical work of the church, and an appreciation of the historic development with a keen sense for the demands of the present.

CHURCH ORGANIZATION IN NEW YORK CITY.

BY PROFESSOR JOHN J. STEVENSON, PH.D.

From The New York Observer (Undenom.), September 10, 1891.

OUR city congregations have been modeled after the country parish—a model which answered fairly well fifty years ago, when men lived near their work and within five or ten minutes' walk of their churches. But New York is no longer the huge village of fifty years ago; the change began in 1850 and it has been increasing rapidly since the close of the Civil War. Prior to 1860, business life here was thought intense; it is vastly more intense now. The hours of daily toil have been shortened, it is true, but at a great cost to the worker, for more work is done in less time and the struggle for place is severer each year. An immense foreign population has been unloaded on us; the agricultural population of the whole country has been sending sons and daughters to live here in boarding houses while struggling for fame or fortune.

Religious organizations have been affected with the rest; the old type of organization, the solid family church, is almost a memory. In the middle wards on the west side, churches are merely ways along which or through which crowds go as they would follow a business street. Even the churches in Harlem tell the same story. Apartment and boarding houses are everywhere, and many large congregations have little more of real existence than the cloud banner on a mountain peak. The form is constant, but the material is ever changing. This floating material has "sampled" the vari-

ous pastors of the region and it demands a high type of pulpit eloquence, while at the same time, conscious of more than its value, it demands much individual attention from the pastor. Formerly church machinery was simple—a Sabbath-school and a Ladies' Missionary Society practically comprehended all, so that the pastors and session easily kept track of everything and guided it. Now the kinds of work are legion, and the hold upon them is very slender.

The change in church conditions came so gradually that full recognition of it was too late for our half-manned churches to protect themselves. Family clusters disappeared slowly and the unsettled floating groups came in not much more rapidly. The newcomers were restless, capable of doing an enormous amount of good work, if well directed; of doing a vast amount of injury, if ill-directed or left alone. Pastors accustomed to the old methods and to the old type of people failed to adjust themselves completely to the new conditions, despite their most faithful efforts. The sessions, composed of busy men, living far away from their business and too often far away from the church, ignorant of the changing conditions or ignoring them, could render little assistance; at best, the elders could give to religious work only of the hours devoted by others to recreation or to personal improvement. They could hardly undertake to organize and to manage detailed work in directions enough to prevent restless people from wasting their energies and doing injury to the congregation. When earnest men planned new work or desired to introduce methods not tested by experience, assent rather than consent was given by pastor and elders, who required as the only condition an acknowledgment of session's right of control. From small beginnings there has grown up in and around our churches a host of religious and semi-religious voluntary associations, often receiving money by church collections, making free use of the church buildings for various purposes from popular lectures down to Mrs. Jarley's waxworks, yet so nearly independent that any interference by session would be regarded as impertinent meddling and would lead to difficulty in the congregation. Too frequently even the Sabbath-school is a voluntary association, so that, though it is supported by church collections, its teachers would resent as simply outrageous any proposition that the session should appoint the superintendent or should demand a thorough accounting for expenditure of funds. Teaching in

Sabbath-school or the performance of any work appears to be regarded by many as a courtesy whereby the pastor and session are placed under obligations. The rage for office holding and for absolute individual freedom makes almost necessary a regular organization with full staff of officers for each kind of work.

A store, in which each buyer runs his department without reference to the rest, feeling that his is so far the most important that he must get the lion's share of the capital without being called to account for method or expenditure, would be an object of ridicule. Yet this is practically the condition in congregations where voluntary associations of all sorts from King's Daughters down to lodges of Sons of Temperance clamor for the use of the church buildings. The only reason for existence of the congregation, as understood by many workers, is to provide money for their especial hobby, which is vastly more important than saving souls by any Scripture method. Regular church work is, for many, secondary, while that of the incidental concerns is all-important. Voluntary societies absorb a great part of the energy; a part of what remains finds its way into the Sabbath school—with what effect can be ascertained by examining the report of Presbytery's committee on Sabbath-school work.

A return to system is needed. Church buildings and church members must be regarded as simply so much capital to be put out at usury; to do this well we must return to Presbyterian order. The session is the responsible head, to which belongs the oversight of every organization within the congregation or making use of its property.

But the pastor and session cannot attend to the details of church work as it is today; they may plan, they may raise money and they may do other work, but there is a limit to their capabilities as men—and in New York, that limit is reached very soon. Few sessions in this city can hold their meetings in the afternoon; comparatively few sessions are represented steadily by ruling elders at the afternoon meetings of Presbytery. If the details of the work are to be cared for properly, clearly congregations must cease their dependence on voluntary assistance in responsible positions; the work must be done by men whose sole business it is; there must be assistant pastors, holding a position of responsibility to the session through the pastor. A congregation with a shrewd, energetic pastor, who does not fear to preach the message with which Paul startled Felix, and provided with two

or three by as many would do New York.

For it is a mode of side warfare tested were not even wards, with boarding where, be one in the Christian Association larger or with the a delegation, tors, who cepted by be found tematized. All mem kept bus opportu occur in contract sluggish to weak to the pa

A concentr mission buildings growing help and should be least wit be kept important vicinity will be t distance should b son as parent.

It is s church i pastors, ment. Schauff put in three m tions, an tration; real est fewer s Business are too petition their ho

or three efficient clerical assistants, aided by as many women to act as Bible readers, would do untold good anywhere in New York.

For it is not necessary to confine this mode of operations to down-town and east-side wards, where the City Missions has tested well a plan very closely akin to it; not even to the 9th, 15th, 16th, and 20th wards, which have so many apartment and boarding houses; it will answer well anywhere, because it will lead to work for every one in the congregation. A Young Men's Christian Association, a Young Women's Association, modelled in purpose after the larger organizations, should be connected with the church, but each should be under a delegated head, one of the assistant pastors, who would follow a definite plan accepted by the session. Other work would be found and plenty of it; it could be systematized and kept fully under control. All members of the congregation would be kept busy and the devil would have little opportunity to work ill. Strikes rarely occur in good times when all are under contract; so in church work; only during sluggish periods do voluntary societies rise to weaken church work and to prove a bane to the pastor.

A congregation thus organized should concentrate its efforts. Instead of planting mission stations in contracted or uninviting buildings, such as preclude hopes of their growing into congregations needing only help and not support, the staff of workers should be utilized near the church or at least within reach of it. The people would be kept in touch with the work and, more important still, with each other. When the vicinity ceases to afford work for all, then will be the time to begin mission work at a distance; and when begun, that work should be solely with the aim of making, as soon as possible, a church similar to the parent.

It is said again and again that not every church is able to support a staff of assistant pastors, and many think this is a final argument. But just here is the place for Dr. Schauffler's clean cut statement, so well put in the *City Mission Monthly* two or three months ago: Have fewer congregations, and so diminish the cost of administration; that is, have less money sunk in real estate, need less fuel and light, have fewer sextons, organists, and the rest. Business men appreciate this. When there are too many in one line they tire of competition, they unite, reduce expenses, pay their honest debts, and make a decent living

in addition. Common sense should prevail equally in church work; it would prevail if our sense of spiritual need were as positive as that of bodily need. By combination diminish the number of churches striving to "make ends meet," and therefore in competition. The new church, in each case, will be self-respecting; it will have a strong body of people and means sufficient to sustain a corps of salaried workers, who will discover methods of keeping the members employed. Such a church would soon exhaust its neighborhood, and be compelled to seek an additional outlet for energy. It would be like a regiment properly officered; whereas many an ordinary congregation is hardly better than some of the volunteer regiments at the beginning of the war, provided with an educated colonel, and with wholly untrained but thoroughly self-satisfied officers of lower grades. Surely a well-manned church is no dream; Dr. Rainsford and Dr. Moffet have proved that. Theirs are working churches; the doors are not kept closed during six days each week; they endeavor to give the community something in return for freedom from taxation.

It is said too that it is impossible to secure elders of the right stamp, men who act as faithfully as directors of banks and railroads are familiarly supposed to do. Any such assertion as this is a reflection upon the intelligence and Christianity of Presbyterians; it is closely related to the lament that the Westminster catechisms cannot be taught in mission Sabbath-schools. The catechisms, both larger and shorter, can be taught, are taught to mission children wherever the teacher honestly desires to teach them. In like manner, elders of the right stamp can be found or trained where they are needed. Men to do the work well will be discovered without difficulty as soon as the eldership ceases to be a nominal affair or a merely ornamental appendage.

There is, however, one serious difficulty in the way, which must be removed before this plan can be fully carried out in New York City. The congregations will refuse to unite; and congregationalism has a hold so strong that Presbytery would hesitate long before taking any positive step toward the amalgamation of two congregations. This, however, is no reason for refusing to study and to discuss the question. It is the strongest proof that a wide discussion is needed. Certainly the only hope for Presbyterianism in this city is in a return to Presbyterian methods and the consequent systematizing of the work. To bring this about, little is needed beyond a persistent

presentation of the condition, so that our people may be informed. Presbyterians are set in their ways; but their characteristics are those of the great Teuton race, among whom self has always been subordinated to the common weal; their reason convinced, they are ready for self denial everywhere.

THE TROUBLES IN CHINA.

BY A. P. HAPPER, D.D.

From *The Independent* (Undenomin.), New York, September 10, 1891.

THE extent of the troubles in China and the serious nature of this outbreak of popular violence are very imperfectly understood. China is so different from other countries, and people here are so little acquainted with its condition and character and the position of foreigners in that country, that it is difficult for people to get clear ideas of the matter. A few preliminary statements will help many to appreciate the state of things in that land.

The geography of the country is very different from that of the United States. The rivers run nearly all from the west toward the east, emptying into the Pacific Ocean. As a general remark the country may be divided into three natural divisions. The southern division is bounded on the north by a continuation of the Himalaya range of mountains. It is drained by rivers flowing from the west, north and east and emptying into the ocean a little southeast of the city of Canton. The middle division is the great valley of the Yangtze River. It is one of the great valleys of the world. It extends from the east to the west, some 1,800 miles, and from south to the north from 600 to 800 miles. The Yangtze, rising in the extreme west, flows through the whole length of the valley. It is joined in its course by rivers as large as the Ohio and the Arkansas as they flow into the Mississippi. It also, about the middle of its career, receives the waters from the largest lakes in the country, so that the valley is everywhere well watered and has easy communication by navigable streams to all ports. It has a population of 150,000,000, and there are many and large cities and towns on the banks of its rivers.

The third division is that part of the country which lies between the northern

boundary of the valley of the Yangtze and the great wall of China, which runs from the east to the west on the north. The capital of the Empire, Peking, is less than one hundred miles from the northern boundary, and eighty miles southeast from Peking is Tientsin, its principal seaport.

By the treaties which have been made between China and Western nations within the last fifty years, some twenty-two cities in different parts of the country are open to the residence of foreigners for trade and commerce. These cities are styled treaty ports. Besides these, in accordance with a stipulation made in the 6th article of the French Treaty of 1860, "missionaries are permitted to rent and purchase land in all the provinces, and to erect buildings thereon at pleasure." In accordance with this stipulation, missionaries, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, are residing in many cities and towns which are not treaty ports.

In the absence of any specific census of the foreign population of all classes resident in China, it is safe to state that there are more than 7,000 foreigners resident in China. Of these more than 1,300 are adult Protestant missionaries. As 391 of these are married, 700 will be a low estimate for children; which will make the number of the missionaries and their families to be 2,000. The number of European priests connected with the Roman Catholic missions must be near 1,000. The property belonging to the foreign residents in China will amount to nearly \$100,000,000. The commerce of China, which is principally conducted by foreign merchants, amounts yearly to more than \$200,000,000.

The right to reside in China and engage in all lawful pursuits is secured to citizens of all Western nations by treaties of peace and friendship between China and all these Western nations, duly ratified and exchanged. There are ministers from Western Powers resident at Peking, and China is represented by her ministers in Western lands.

In the treaties of most of the Western Powers there is a special article in reference to Christianity, and those who profess its doctrines. Article VIII of the English treaty, made in 1858, reads thus:

"The Christian religion, as professed by Protestants or Roman Catholics, inculcates the practice of virtue, and teaches man to do as he would be done by. Persons teaching it or professing it shall alike be entitled to the protection of the Chinese authorities; nor shall any such, peaceably pursuing their calling and not offending the laws, be persecuted or interfered with."

The article and the Christian French treaty and explicit

"The mission shall have properties, services; to mission of the country provided for

In Article of 1860 or purchased quoted a

It was very great and protected in so poor of four followed by missions Chinese fulfilled time expiration of June sin, with participation occurred, French massacre subjects Low, in government break of the lives China,

"At the to foreign establish combine plan as adverse management sum per their country in their could have been and being her reduced tations for that the the half children ness, for mortals taken ease, these a which lations

The articles in the French, the Russian, and the American treaties, referring to Christianity, are of the same tenor. The French treaty, in Article XIII, is more full and explicit, and says :

"The members of all Christian communions shall have entire security for their persons, their properties, and the free exercise of their religious services ; and an effective protection shall be given to missionaries who go peaceably into the interior of the country, furnished with passports as provided for in Article VIII."

In Article VI of the supplementary treaty of 1860 is the stipulation about "renting or purchasing land in *all the provinces*," as quoted above.

It was regarded by all Christians as a very gracious Providence that toleration and protection were secured to Christianity in so populous a country by these treaties of four great Western Powers. It was followed by a great increase in the number of missionaries of all communions. The Chinese Government have to a good degree fulfilled their treaty obligation up to this time except in the year 1870. On the 21st of June, 1870, at the treaty port of Tientsin, within eighty miles of Peking, a riot, participated in by tens of thousands, occurred, resulting in the destruction of the French Cathedral and Orphanage, and the massacre of *twenty* French and Russian subjects. The American Minister, Mr. Low, in a dispatch of June 27th to his Government in reference to this terrible outbreak of popular violence, which threatened the lives of all foreigners in the north of China, states the case as follows, viz. :

"At many of the principal places in China open to foreign residence, the Sisters of Charity have established institutions, each of which appears to combine in itself a foundling hospital and an orphan asylum. Finding that the Chinese were averse to placing children in their charge, the managers of these institutions offered a certain sum per head for all the children placed under their control ; it being understood that a child once in their asylum, no parent, relation or guardian could claim, or exercise any control over it. It has been, for some time, asserted by the Chinese, and believed by the non-Catholic foreigners residing here, that the system of paying bounties induced the kidnapping of children for these institutions for the sake of the reward. It is also asserted that the Priests or Sisters, or both, have been in the habit of holding out inducements to have children brought to them in the last stages of illness, for the purpose of being baptized '*in articulo mortis*.' In this way many children have been taken to these institutions in the last stages of disease, baptized there, and taken away dead. All these acts, together with the secrecy and seclusion, which appear to be a part and parcel of the regulations which govern institutions of this character

everywhere, have created suspicions in the minds of the Chinese ; and these suspicions have engendered an *intense hatred* against the Sisters on the part of all the common people who live near a mission : and any rumor concerning the Sisters, or their acts, however improbable or absurd, found thousands of willing and honest believers among the ignorant and superstitious people. Some time about the end of May, or beginning of June, an epidemic prevailed at the Sisters' Institution at Tientsin, and a considerable number of the children died. In some way the report got abroad that the Sisters were killing the children to get their eyes and hearts for the purpose of manufacturing some sort of a medical specific much sought for in Europe and commanding a fabulous price." —Williams, "Middle Kingdom," Second Edition, Vol. II, pp. 760-761.

These rumors excited such a frenzy that led it to the results above stated. The ministers of Western nations at Peking presented a joint note to the Chinese Government for vigorous measures to protect the foreigners and punish the rioters. Prince Kung, the head of the Regency, replied on June 25th "that high officers had already been directed to do everything in their power to suppress the spirit of riot and arrest lawless men." In a few weeks the naval forces of the leading powers in the Eastern Seas had assembled at Tientsin to enforce their demands. The Chinese Government sent a high officer to France to placate the French Emperor and avert a war with France. When the disasters of the war with Germany came the matter was settled by the payment of \$560,000 as an indemnity to the families of those murdered, and for the property destroyed.

But this recent outbreak has occurred in the populous valley of the Yangtze. Instead of being confined to one city, as in the previous one, it has spread to all the cities where foreigners are on both sides of the river, viz., Yang Chow, Wuhu, Ngan King, Tan Yang, Wuseuh, Haiwen, Soo Chow, Tsung King, Chin Kiang, Kiu Kiang, Wusieh (where three English ladies and four children were in great danger, and two Englishmen who went to their rescue were killed), and Tchang.

The *danger* threatened all the foreign residents in the Yangtze Valley, so that the naval vessels of all Western Powers in those waters, as well as those of the Chinese Government, were summoned to their protection. The male residents at Hankow, Kiu Kiang, Wuhu, Chinkiang and Shanghai organized volunteer companies, and armed themselves under Consular supervision to defend their families and property.

This outbreak has occurred most unexpectedly to all the residents in China, both

native and foreign. Various causes have been suggested for the outbreak, and different purposes have been surmised as actuating those who have excited it. But while various opinions are held and expressed as to the purposes and designs of those who have stirred up the outbreak, there is a general agreement as to the means they have used to excite the populace to commit these deeds of violence and plunder. It has been by the circulation of the same kind of rumors that were circulated in Tientsin, twenty-one years ago, viz., that children were killed to get different parts of their bodies with which to make medicine. Every means were used to confirm the widespread and prevailing belief of this calumny. At Kuhu, where the destruction of property was first made, it is stated by a writer in the *North China Herald*, of May 15th :

"The trouble at Wuhu appears to have had its origin in the stock story of taking out the eyes of children at the Roman Catholic orphanages."

After getting possession of the place they proceeded to take up some of the dead bodies and exhibit the mutilated remains. At other places they took up the bodies of children and showed that the eyes had been taken out. Of the riot at Kiukiang, a writer in the *North China Herald*, of June 12th says: "As usual, they made 'the children' the occasion of the outbreak." At Wusueh, twenty-five miles above Kiukiang, where there is no orphanage, and where the two Englishmen were killed, the populace were excited to deeds of murder and arson, by persons carrying through the streets a basket containing four infants which they said were being taken to the orphanage at Kiukiang. Another writer, in the *North China Herald*, of July 10th, says :

"The recent riots in the different cities have been incited by inflammatory reports of murdered babies and human remains being divested of eyes and internal organs for medicines."

It may be stated in explanation of the fact that this calumny of taking the eyes and internal organs of children with which to make medicine, should so suddenly excite the people at each of these places, that during the last twenty-one years a little book in Chinese has been widely and persistently distributed, in which these statements are made. The book has been translated into English by the Rev. John L. Nevius, D.D., of Chefoo, and bears the title, "The Deathblow to Corrupt Doctrine." Christianity is referred to as the

corrupt doctrine. The common people are pervaded with this belief, and the evil disposed persons have used this as the means of arousing them to an intense excitement, and who can be surprised at the terrible results.

I purposely refrain from expressing any opinion on the purposes or plans of those who have stirred up this sedition, because I do not know what they are. The thing which, in my judgment, requires the careful consideration of all men, is this: What can be done to prevent the recurrence of a similar outbreak in the future? There is the general concurrence of all the writers on the outbreak that it is the reception of so many children in orphanages, and the consequent death of so many children, that has been used to excite the populace to these fearful outbreaks, leading to such serious and widespread consequences. Under these circumstances, it would occur to most persons that the most obvious thing to be done is to discontinue that part of mission work which is so offensive to the people and which gives occasion to such results. The propriety of this action is confirmed by the expressed desire of high officers of the Chinese Government to that effect. The viceroy of the two Lake Provinces on the Yangtze, Chang Chih-tung, who is the ablest officer next to Li Hung Chang, when taking prompt measures to restrain the populace, "has advised the missionaries to give up collecting orphans for the present." He thus shows his opinion as to the occasion of the outbreak, and what is necessary to prevent its recurrence.

In the year 1870, after the terrible massacre at Tientsin, the Chinese Government presented to the ministers of the Western Powers at Peking certain things from which missionaries were to refrain, in order to prevent a recurrence of the outbreak of violence. The first thing referred to was this, the missionaries were to cease receiving the Chinese children into orphanages. The matter was expressed by the Chinese very diplomatically, thus: "That *only* the children of *native* Christians be received into Roman Catholic orphanages."

Most persons would suppose that such a reasonable and obvious requirement would be at once complied with; but no attention was given to it, and the fearful calamities of May and June, 1891, have occurred. As these calamities have been so widespread, and affected the interests and subjects of all Western Powers, and the peaceful relations of so many nations with China, it has become a matter of *international impor-*

tance, and
matic con

It is a
persons n
not only
dangers
commun
fants an
orphanag
tial meth
may not
ter of ex
gation a
already i
between
that the
eral We
have be
the Ch
China,
diploma
posed th
results,
ness of
accede
Chinese
would a
the con
he may
the mis
matter-
claimed
commu
Catholi
on the
ten ye
negotin
exchan
king fo
any ob
was fro
the Re
should
in Chi
native
tive C
dant p
receivi
those
ages to
and ac
concor
and a
of mis
visers
to thi
It h
may
culty
never
the p

tance, and should become a matter of diplomatic conference and action.

It is an obvious truth that no class of persons may pursue a course of action which not only endangers themselves, but also endangers the lives and property of whole communities. The baptism of dying infants and the reception of infants into orphanages are not such *integral* and *essential* methods of missionary work that they may not be properly intermitted as a *matter of expediency*. The fact that the propagation and professing of Christianity has already become the subject of negotiations between China and Western Powers, and that the articles in the treaties of the several Western nations in reference thereto have been accepted and acted upon by "all the Christian communions" laboring in China, properly brings this matter under diplomatic consideration. It may be supposed that now, in view of the deplorable results, there will be an immediate willingness of the Roman Catholic communion to accede to this reasonable request of the Chinese officials. If they do not then it would appear that it may be presented to the consideration of the Pope of Rome that he may give the necessary instruction to the missionaries of that communion in this matter—the Pope has for these 250 years claimed and exercised the prerogative of commanding and directing the Roman Catholic missionaries how they should carry on their work in China. Within the last ten years the Chinese Government has negotiated with the Pope of Rome as to the exchange of the site of a cathedral in Peking for another site which is not open to any objection. Two hundred years ago it was frequently a matter of consideration in the Roman Consistory as to what terms should be used to express the name of God in Chinese, and what rites connected with native customs should be permitted to native Christians in China. So there is abundant precedent for referring the matter of receiving the children of others besides those of the native Christians in orphanages to the Pope of Rome for consideration and adjudication. All lovers of peace and concord—among the nations of the earth—and all who are interested in the progress of missions in China will hope that the advisers of the Chinese people will help them to this desirable result.

It becomes a necessity that some method may be devised that will relieve the difficulty in regard to missionary work. It never can be successfully prosecuted under the protection of gunboats.

THE NATURAL HISTORY OF THE HERESY-HUNTER.

BY THE REV. WASHINGTON GLADDEN.

From *The Christian Union* (Udenom.), New York, September 19, 1891.

"And what I say unto you, I say unto all, Watch!"—Mark xiii. 37.

THE obligation of vigilance is universal; is vigilance always a virtue? Everything depends on the spirit in which the watching is done. What is the motive of your vigilance? What are you watching for? It is the reporter's business to keep his eyes and ears open—but for what? For virtuous or for vicious deeds? For the things that make for the edification of society, or for the things that make for its destruction? For the fragrance of moral loveliness, or the stench of moral carrion? What are his senses trained to detect? The answers to this question will determine whether he is a public benefactor or a public nuisance. The senses can be trained as well as the muscles. The telegrapher stands talking with you in the deafening clatter of the instruments round about him; you distinguish nothing; but he is reading off a clear message from some sounder near by; his ear is trained to gather these articulate words out of all this noise. The eye sees what it is trained to see; the ear hears what it is trained to hear; the olfactory catch the odors on which they are intent. Our watching is not, therefore, an instinctive process; it is a function which may be educated; and the question whether our vigilance is profitable can be answered only by carefully investigating the objects upon which it is directed. It may be of infinite advantage to us if we watch for the right things and watch in the right places and with the right motive; and it may be of infinite injury to us if the reverse of all this is true.

In his lectures on "The Influence of Jesus," Dr. Phillips Brooks makes the following statement, which will aid us in the discriminations now before us:

"The sin with which Jesus was always upbraiding the Pharisees—what he called hypocrisy—is at once a spiritual and an intellectual vice. It was a disbelief of the greatness of God which made it possible for them to dream of imposing upon him. It was a pride in themselves which could not look into the vastness of truth. The unbelief which Jesus upbraids is not the doubt of special doctrine, but that narrow and worldly temper to which the whole world of mystery was inconceivable. The doubter whom Christ rebukes is not the earnest and

eager believer who has become lost in the highways of faith. It is the unventuresome spirit which is incapable of faith at all which has reduced the world to materialism, like the Sadducee, or made duty into law and religion into ceremony like the Pharisee. For neither of them was there any outlook. For his disciples, the word of intellectual life as of moral discipline was, 'Watch. Expect new things. The world is large. Out of the darkness shall come light. Be ready for surprises.' Such readiness is the rightful possession only of men who live not in the forms but in the principles of things; and so the spiritual thoroughness into which Jesus led his disciples is bound up closely with the intellectual progress which they attained."

These words of deepest insight discover to us the true posture of Christian faith, and the temper of a kind of unbelief which always exists, and which is the more fatal to all religious advancement because it supposes itself to be, and proclaims itself to be, the only genuine faith. "That unventuresome spirit which is incapable of faith at all," which has "made duty into law and religion into ceremony" or dogma, to which there is no outlook, for which there is no expectation—that spirit is always sure to vaunt itself as the exponent and custodian of the faith. It always has done so since the days of the Pharisees; it always will do so till the millennium. The people to whom there is no open vision, the people whose religion rests wholly upon a fixed routine or a stereotyped symbol, are the people who always establish themselves as the managers and leaders of the sects; their mission is not to assist, but to hinder, the development of the religious life of the Church. With those who try to keep their eyes open to the revelations which God is always making through his providence and by his Spirit they are often openly at war.

We find in the Old Testament traces of a conflict of this sort between the prophetic and the priestly classes. The priests represented the religion of routine; the prophets the religion of insight and expectation. From the days of the captivity onward the priests had it all their own way; the voice of the prophets was heard but faintly. The last prophetic utterance, that of Malachi, is a swift denunciation of the blindness and the dead formalism of the priestly class:

"A son honoreth his father, and a servant his master: if I then be a Father, where is mine honor? and if I be a Master, where is my fear? saith the Lord of hosts unto you, O priests, that despise my name.

. . . And now, O ye priests, this commandment is for you. If ye will not hear, and if ye will not lay it to heart, to give glory unto my name, saith the Lord of hosts, I will even send a curse upon you, and I will curse your blessings. . . . For the priests' lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth: for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts. But ye have departed out of the way; ye have caused many to stumble at the law; ye have corrupted the covenant of Levi, saith the Lord of hosts."

This word of Malachi is but the keynote of the denunciations pronounced against this whole class by John the Baptist, the last of the Hebrew prophets, and by our Lord himself, at a later day. These sticklers for ceremony, these ecclesiastical martinets, these devotees of routine, were the only people in the land who felt the weight of our Master's curse. "Blind guides," he calls them. "Ye fools and blind!" he cries out more than once in hot indignation against them. "Ye can discern the face of the sky, but ye cannot discern the signs of the times." Vision there is none. You know nothing of any truth outside your formularies. You are utterly oblivious of all that God is doing in the world to-day. "Ye build the sepulchres of the prophets [the dead ones] and garnish the tombs of the righteous" that lived in former generations; but that brave fidelity to present truth, that quick response to the immediate call of God, which made these men prophets, is the very spirit that you are trying to strangle in this generation; "wherefore ye witness to yourselves that ye are sons of them that slew the prophets."

The day never comes when the truth of these words is not made manifest by many living examples. There never is a time when the slavish devotees of routine and tradition are not making war upon those who look for more light to break forth from God's holy Word and God's marvelous universe; never a time when the children of the night are not seeking to expel from their fellowship the children of the day. The reverent and confident expectation which Christ enjoins is an offense which many a disciple of his has expiated at the hands of those who assume the direction of his kingdom in the world.

Yet we must suppose that these men themselves give some sort of meaning to the Saviour's injunction, and imagine themselves to be in some way obeying it. "What I say unto you, I say unto all, Watch." What do they suppose these

words (enjoined)

It is for shortco routine they be They h tion to obligat anybod confess technio quire a see wh rules i always the op ren; l tropspe wheth part o tional ance o of the

Nov picion easily which Inde precis ness are al tians. scoffe spiriti tion i cond sees (the to en the again try. and had him Her talk that hold cons man con join out like if h Tha tian I

words to mean? What duty do they find enjoined in them?

It is the duty of suspicion and criticism. It is for errors, for aberrations of belief, for shortcomings in the observance of the routine to which they are devoted, that they believe themselves appointed to watch. They have a standard of doctrine, subscription to which they insist upon as of primary obligation, and they watch to see whether anybody varies from that standard in the confession of his faith. They have certain technical rules of conduct to which they require all men to conform, and they watch to see whether anybody deviates from these rules in his daily practice. Vigilant they always are; argus-eyed in their scrutiny of the opinions and the motives of their brethren; but their inquisition always has a retrospective reference; they look to see whether there is perfect conformity on the part of other people to a historic or traditional rule. Their vigilance is the vigilance of a detective; their occupation is that of the heresy-hunter.

Now, it is obvious that this habit of suspicion and criticism is a habit that may easily lead to great abuses. The spirit which it fosters is not the spirit of Christ. Indeed, the temper of the heresy-hunter is precisely the temper which we often witness in those incorrigible unbelievers who are always fond of finding fault with Christians. The heresy-hunter within and the scoffer without the Church are kindred spirits. Both of them find their occupation in picking flaws with the beliefs or the conduct of their fellow-men. The Pharisees (the traditionists) and the Sadducees (the skeptics) were at one in their endeavors to entangle our Lord in his talk. When the one party failed in making a point against him, the other was always ready to try. "The chief priests and the scribes and the elders," when they heard that he had silenced the Sadducees, "sent unto him certain of the Pharisees and of the Herodians, that they might catch him in talk." This hateful, censorious temper that likes to find fault, that rejoices in holding up to view the errors and the inconsistencies of others, is a bad trait of human nature that is not wholly eliminated at conversion; and the man who before he joined the Church was fond of pointing out the failings of church members, will be likely to become a mighty hunter of heresy if he ever becomes a leader in the Church. That this is the very antithesis of the Christian temper I need not stop to prove.

But some will be asking whether this is

not a harsh judgment upon the men who are so active in detecting and punishing heresy. Are not many of them truly honest and conscientious men? Undoubtedly. These Pharisees were honest and conscientious men. Saul of Tarsus was a thoroughly honest and conscientious man. He verily thought that he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth. He thought that he ought to exterminate the Nazarene heresy. But the spirit that predominated in his life was the spirit of the detective and the heresy-hunter, the spirit that is always on the watch for errors and faults in others; and when a man's conscience prescribes this as one of the main duties of life—when a man's conscience makes him sharp to see and swift to punish other men's failures and sins—then his conscience is behaving itself in a very unchristian fashion, and the first thing that he needs to do is to get his conscience converted, so that it shall be a Christian conscience, ruled by the law of love, not rejoicing in the iniquity or the error of his fellow-men, but ready to believe all things good of them, and to hope for things still better.

The indulgence of this temper and the cultivation of this habit of suspicion and criticism are sure to result in great intellectual and spiritual blindness. For this spirit can only exist in connection with fixed and rigid traditional rules. If a man is to set himself up as the detective of heresy and the censor of conduct, he must, of course, have some unvarying standards with which he can compare the opinions and the actions of men. He must have his beliefs all formulated, and his laws of behavior all laid down. There is, therefore, no opportunity in his system for the free play of the soul's powers in the investigation of truth. Such an investigation might result in some modification of the formulas and rules by which this censor judges; thus his infallibility would be discredited and his occupation gone. He is, then, and must be, from the very nature of the function which he undertakes to fulfill, a foe of all development. He is watching for a lack of conformity to his standards; how can he be watching, at the same time, for new truth that may make these standards obsolete? It is, therefore, with him a fundamental maxim that no essential change can be made in the statements of truth which he holds. His bondage to the *ipsissima verba* of the ancient symbols becomes unquestioning and even abject.

When a man has fallen into this mental

habit, he at once becomes one of the most dangerous adversaries of the kingdom of God. For the very genius of that kingdom is movement, progress. The mustard-seed that becomes a tree, the leaven that pervades and quickens the whole lump, the kernel that springs up secretly and becomes first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear—these are the types by which our Lord describes it. And he who assumes that it is stationary and unprogressive in any department of its life—in its intellectual expression, in its social organization, in its practical working—so that one formula of philosophy forever declares it, and one rule of polity forever incorporates it, and one type of character forever reveals it—directly contradicts the word of the Lord, and sets himself in opposition to the very genius of his religion. What is more, he who adopts this rule of judgment finds himself all the while at variance with the facts of life and of history. "There can be no substantial change in Christian philosophy," he insists. But such changes are taking place, and have been taking place in all the ages. And so he is tempted to conceal, to misrepresent, or to ignore the plainest facts; he learns the easy lesson of insincerity; he becomes a palterer with the truth that is given him to teach. And thus the intellectual vice to which he is addicted becomes the parent of a grievous moral fault by which the very foundations of character are undermined.

And this is not all. The method which he has adopted of rigidly enforcing traditional rules leads him to put the greatest emphasis upon things that are of the least importance, and to be quite unmindful of things that are of the highest moment. He is a disciple of the letter and not of the spirit; and therefore a slight deviation from the letter of the formula becomes a greater fault than the most flagrant violation of moral law. Not long ago an assembly of ministers in another State had two offenders to deal with. One of them, an earnest and blameless man, had taught the doctrine of conditional immortality—the doctrine that the punishment of the incorrigibly wicked finally ends with their extinction; the other had frequently been drunk on the streets. The first of these was expelled from the ministry; the second was forgiven and reinstated. This is only a specimen of what is taking place very often in ecclesiastical assemblies. In these assemblies, as everybody knows, the whole stress of the inquiry into the fitness of a man to preach the Gospel is commonly put

upon his intellectual conformity to the traditional creed, while the deeper things of character, of temper, of moral and spiritual fitness, are either ignored or touched upon in the most cursory way. We all know ministers, some of us know a good many of them, who are morally unfit to preach the Gospel. I do not mean that they are drunkards or counterfeiters, but they are ugly and spiteful and mean-spirited; they have the unhappy faculty of getting the ill will of most of the people that they come in contact with, and they preach what they think is the Gospel in such a hard, fierce, bitter way that it drives more men away from Christ than it wins to his service. That is the kind of men they are, and everybody knows what kind of men they are; but when such an one comes before a council or a presbytery it is not often that any voice is heard against installing him; for he is sure to be found fearfully and wonderfully orthodox, and orthodoxy is the principal thing. But let some minister of the most gentle and Christian temper, who has proved himself to have the power of winning the love of men, not only for himself, but also for his Master and his message, come before this same council, and indicate some slight intellectual divergence from the historic creed, and the voices of the heresy-hunters will be raised in a chorus of protest against him.

Such a perverted judgment as this is quite too current throughout the Church. Many persons subscribe to it who are not in any proper sense hunters of heresy; but it is to the heresy-hunters that its currency is due. It is they who have shaped it and imposed it upon the churches. And it is high time that those who have hitherto acquiesced in it began to ask themselves what kind of judgment this is that puts the details of doctrine above the interests of character, and punishes a small difference of opinion ten times more severely than a great sin.

Another result of the development of the detective element in the character of a professing Christian is a tendency to pessimism. The standards, as we have seen, by which such a censor judges of men's beliefs and men's actions are always traditional standards. They were well enough adapted to the life of a past age, but they are not adapted to the present age. The thought of men has gone away from these formularies; the changed conditions of life have vacated these rules of conduct of all their binding force. This traditionist finds, therefore, that men do not respect his

standard
dismay.
tains of
morals a
is sure,
gloomy v
and fills
the dege
who ma
likely to
discover
sees wha
spends h
errors a
clusion
sinful w
give any
pepsia.
ascetic v
The han
of truth
sees. T
that he
I he
"When
more al
hearers
time in
made
part of
room le
nauch
feebly
by the
the tru
though
much
aspect
hunter
whole
dom o
less, s
victory
he see
contain
By
ple wi
form
no rig
talks
backs
never
stealt
lie op
carefu
disag
subtl
often
The
perso
again

standards, and the discovery fills him with dismay. It is a sign to him that the foundations of the great deep of theology and morals are broken up, and that the deluge is surely coming. It makes him take gloomy views of the present state of society, and fills his mouth with lamentations over the degeneracy of the age. Besides, a man who makes it his business to find fault is likely to find plenty of it. We generally discover what we are looking for. The eye sees what it is trained to see. And he who spends his time in watching other people's errors and sins naturally comes to the conclusion that this is a very erroneous and sinful world. Feeding on such stuff will give any man a bad kind of spiritual dyspepsia. And so he comes to take severe and ascetic views of doctrine as well as of life. The harsher and more threatening aspects of truth are the only ones that he distinctly sees. Total depravity is the only dogma that he heartily believes in.

I heard a sermon once on the text, "Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound," and the comment by many hearers was that the preacher spent so much time in showing how sin abounded, and made such a strong presentation of that part of the text, that there was very little room left in which to show how grace did much more abound; that truth was very feebly presented, and the impression left by the sermon was exactly the reverse of the truth taught by the text, namely, that, though grace somewhat abounded, sin did much more abound. This is exactly the aspect of things which our friend the heresy-hunter takes comfort in portraying. His whole view of the world, and of the kingdom of God in the world, is gloomy, hopeless, sullen. He has no real faith in the victory of righteousness; all the signs that he sees are ominous of evil; his horoscope contains not a single star.

By and by he comes to feel that the people whom he is watching, who fail to conform to his standards, are people who have no rights that he is bound to respect. He talks bitterly about them behind their backs, saying things of them that he would never venture to say to them; trying in stealthy and ungenerous ways to create public opinion against them. He is not always careful to tell the truth about those who disagree with him; misrepresentation of a subtle and mischievous sort is a weapon often in his hand. This is natural enough. The detective is not commonly a judicial person; his business is to make out a case against the person he is watching. He who

takes up this rôle is likely to become unscrupulous and reckless in his censure, so that his zeal for the truth comes at last to be heated with the flame of a pure malignity. There is a solemn lesson in the etymology of the devil's name. *Diabolos* means primarily an accuser.

Now, my friends, the picture that I have shown you is not a fancy sketch; it is not a caricature; it is a faithful representation of a class of men who are to be found among us, and who make themselves quite prominent as the defenders and custodians of the faith. And I ask you to judge whether the character in which these traits are seen is a representative Christian character. Are the men of whom these things are wholly true, or even approximately true, the men who ought to be ruling in the councils of our churches and giving tone and direction to our ecclesiastical bodies? Is a man who finds in the Saviour's injunction to watch his commission as a theological detective, and who by virtue of this office becomes the devotee of traditions and blind to all the revelations that God is making in the world to-day; who thus loses all sense of perspective in his moral judgments, and, while keeping a keen conscience for peppermint and caraway and fennel, lets judgment, mercy, and truth go by default; who becomes a pessimist in his views of the present time and an exponent only of that which is harsh and hopeless and forbidding in religion, and who, in his zeal for the extirpation of heresy, often fails to be just to those whom he seeks to censure—is this the style of man to whom the churches of this land are to look for leadership? God forbid! For the temper which I have described is as completely opposite to all that is Christian as anything can be, and the mental habit which goes with it is the essence of the deadliest and most damning unbelief. Who is a skeptic if he is not a skeptic who has no faith in the virtue of man nor in the victorious grace of God? Who is an infidel if he is not an infidel who rejects with scorn the clear revelations of God's truth that come in the enlarging knowledge of his works and of his ways among the children of men? If there is one law that is written all over both Testaments, that is stamped upon the very foundations of the faith, it is the law of progress in the kingdom of God; who, then, is the enemy of Christianity if it is not the man who makes void this law by his traditions?

These questions are likely to be urged, in the future, with some persistency. For there are those among us who find in the

command of Christ something besides a detective's commission, and in the Gospel that he has given us a living force and not a crystallized form; and when these men are called to account by the traditionists and the heresy-hunters, it is not likely that they will always be content with defending themselves. They ought not to suffer themselves to stand on the defensive. They ought not to allow that the view of truth which they hold is one that needs to be excused or apologized for; they ought not to admit that the kind of men of whom we have been speaking have any right to judge them. When the right of men to preach the Gospel is challenged, some people will wish to look into the right of the challengers. Not in any irreverent or revolutionary spirit, but with the emphasis of a deep conviction, these men will be asked: "What is this religion in whose behalf you appear as the prosecuting attorneys? Is it Christianity, or is it something else? Is it a religion whose law is tradition and whose spirit is distrust of God and men? Is it a religion whose votaries are detectives rather than disciples, and whose leaders are censors rather than seers? Is it a religion that makes men so blind to moral distinctions that they count a small heresy worse than a great sin? If it is, then it is not the Christian religion, and you are not the representatives of Christ in the world.

"What is more, we do not believe that the detective or the inquisitor has any place in Christ's service. We find no such office provided for or even suggested. We believe that the temper and habit of mind which are developed by this pursuit are utterly foreign to Christianity. We believe that it is not by ferreting out and punishing unbelief and error, but by declaring the truth, and by incarnating and living the truth, that the Church is to be kept pure. Tares will grow with the wheat, but it is not our business to pull up the tares; it is our business to sow the good seed everywhere, beside all waters, and let God take care of the tares.

"So, then, we meet your challenge of our right to preach the Gospel, by demurring to your whole proceeding as unwarranted, and by calling on you to show that the system which you are trying to propagate is not a bad counterfeit of the true faith of Christ. While the other heresies are being investigated, we want the heresy of suspicion, and the heresy of hate, and the heresy of cold distrust, and the heresy of moral blindness, and the heresy of pessimism, and the heresy of evil speaking

looked into; and we desire, in all candor and kindness, to know whether those who find in their own eyes such beams as these ought not first to cast them out before proceeding to cast out the motes of theological error from the eyes of their brethren. God forbid that we should judge our brethren; but when our brethren insist on judging us, then they shall be judged—and the standard to which we make appeal is not the Westminster Confession, nor the Augsburg Symbol, nor the Thirty-nine Articles, but the Sermon on the Mount. And when those who in their lives and in their doctrine are constantly setting at naught that divine teaching rise up to condemn us because we have ventured to reject some phrase that men have fashioned, we shall simply answer that they are greatly exceeding their authority."

And now, brethren beloved, let us use the liberty that belongs to us and the opportunity that is ours of proclaiming to men the truth as it is in Jesus, in all its simplicity and purity. We are not on the defensive here; we do not borrow leave to be the disciples of Jesus Christ of any organization; we are responsible to our Master, and to him alone. The truth that he helps us to see, that we will try to tell; the life that he lived in the flesh, that we will endeavor to live. If any shall call in question our right to teach the Gospel as we understand it, we shall look first to see whether their lives show that they have been with Jesus and have learned his method and his secret. If they have not, we will not trouble ourselves to answer their questions; if they have, we will sit at their feet and learn of them; but even they shall not judge us, for one is our Master, even Christ.

And these words of our Master—"What I say unto you, I say unto all, Watch"—we will try, more and more, to learn what they mean. We know that they do not warrant us in watching other disciples with the eye of the critic or the censor; we know that this habit of mind is, above most things, hateful to him. To watch ourselves lest we become suspicious and censorious and credulous of evil tales about our neighbors; to watch our conduct lest we hurt them by want of fidelity or want of sympathy—this, we know, is part of the lesson of vigilance that he seeks to teach us. But this is the smallest part of the lesson. To watch for hurts that we can heal, for halting steps that we can steady, for burdens of infirmity or trouble that we can help to carry, for ways in which we may give our thought, our care, our love, ourselves, for the en-

larging a
our fellow
blest fide
of symbo
of right
calling o

And t
Lord—
literal f
to them
man ast
sky—bu
ual pres
ners, in
and a
things,
the Lo
then,"
messag
declare
him is
things
be full
heard,
with a
that w
news,
of the
energ
ing, b
It is r
suspici
nothin
our w
man.
deme
busin
with
fulln

A
ghost
Germ
good
some
once
requ
man
will
rem
corp
jour
of a
was
go
occ
Sap
Ch

larging and the brightening of the lives of our fellow-men, serving them with humblest fidelity and leading them with cords of sympathy and brotherhood in the ways of righteousness and peace—this is the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.

And then to watch for the coming of our Lord—not for his coming in that coarse, literal fashion which some disciples picture to themselves—not to see the figure of a man astride of a cumulus somewhere in the sky—but to discern the signs of his spiritual presence in purer laws and gentler manners, in a braver virtue and a brighter hope and a stronger faith—to watch for such things, to expect them, and to be glad in the Lord when we see them. "This, then," said the beloved disciple, "is the message which we have heard of him and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all." "And these things write we unto you that your joy may be full." This is the message that we have heard, brethren; God help us to utter it with all clear fidelity. This is the gospel that we have to preach, the gospel of good news, the gospel of peace, the glorious gospel of the blessed God. It is not with the energy of fear or despair that we are working, but with the energy of a mighty hope. It is not with the weapons of criticism and suspicion that we are fighting; we have nothing to do with them; the weapons of our warfare are faith in God and love for man. It is not with grim visages and glum demeanor that we go about our Master's business; for hath he not said, "Lo, I am with you alway!" and in his presence is fullness of joy.

PARAGRAPHIC.

A VERY poor actor having played the part of the ghost in "Hamlet" for many years, Saphir, the German wit, on seeing him, said: "It would be a good thing if this man gave up the ghost, so that somebody else could take his part." A young poet once sent the humorist an "Ode to Immortality," requesting his opinion of it. Saphir returned the manuscript, with the message: "This package will never reach its address." "Three persons," remarked the wit, "sleep soundly—a child, a corpse, and a night watchman." During his sojourn in X—Saphir was frequently in the society of a well-known theatrical manager, whose dulness was notorious. "How strange it is that my legs go to sleep every day!" he remarked, upon one occasion. "How can you wonder?" returned Saphir, "they are always in your company."—*Churchman*.

ABOUT the late Lord President Inglis, a correspondent in the *British Weekly* writes:

In his earlier days his temper was sometimes found a useful possession, as on one occasion when he endeavored in vain (through an interpreter) to get some small fragment of truth from a Gaelic witness at Inverness, and the following dialogue occurred:

Inglis. "Did he strike Munro with the stick?"

Witness. "They were saying that he did."

I. "Did you see it?"

W. "I was not looking much."

I. "But did he do it?"

W. "I do not believe that his father's son would do anything wrong."

I. "But did he strike the blow that morning?"

W. "It was a fine morning whatever."

I. (turning from the interpreter to the witness): "Sir, will you answer, yes or no, if your language admits of so fine a distinction?"

Who is not shocked by the answer of the college porter, charged to admit none but dons, to Mrs. Whately? "You canna come in, mem." "Oh, but I'm the archbishop's lady." "Well, mem, my orders are positive. I would not let you in, even if you were the archbishop's wife."—*Churchman*.

A YORKSHIRE vicar once received the following notice regarding a marriage from a parishioner: "This is to give you notis that I and Miss Jemima Arabella Brearley is comin' to your church on Saturday afternoon nex, to undergo the operation of matrimony at your hands. Please be prompt, as the cab is hired by the hour." The "operation" was performed in due course.—*Churchman*.

A BRIGHT ten-year-old girl, whose father is addicted to amateur photography, attended a trial at court the other day for the first time. This was her account of the judge's charge: "The judge made a long speech to the jury of twelve men, and then sent them off into a little dark room to develop."—*Zion's Herald*.

A CORRESPONDENT of *The Evangelist* protests vigorously in that paper against the course of a certain daily journal in denouncing Professor Briggs while he is under citation for trial. Speaking of the writer of these articles, he says: "I cannot say what his capacity for criticising such scholars as Professors Briggs and Brown may be. But it is very evident from the tone of his creed that though he may know 'small Latin and less Greek,' he is nevertheless a pronounced hebraist!"

"THAT commercial spirit which judges a pastor like a cart-horse—by what he can draw," is the Rev. Dr. Sturtevant's humorous way of describing a feeling which is perhaps not quite so rare in this country as he generously seems to imagine.—*Independent (London)*.

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

BOOK REVIEWS.

DIE ENTSTEHUNG DES ALTTESTAMENTLICHEN KANONS. Historisch-kritische Untersuchung von Dr. G. WILDEBOER, Professor der Theologie zu Groningen. Gotha: Perthes; New York: Stechert, 1891. 8vo, pp. xii., 164, 3.60 marks.

THE CHANGE OF ATTITUDE TOWARD THE BIBLE. A lecture given under the auspices of the Boston Board of the American Institute of Sacred Literature, February 17th, 1891. By JOSEPH HENRY THAYER, Professor in Harvard University. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1891. 12mo, pp. 69.

THE ORACLES OF GOD. Nine lectures on the nature and extent of Biblical Inspiration and on the special significance of the Old Testament Scriptures at the present time. With two appendices. By W. SANDAY, M.A., D.D., LL.D., Dean Ireland's Professor of Exegesis, Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford Preacher at Whitehall. Second edition, revised. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1891. 12mo, pp. xv., 156.

WHO WROTE THE BIBLE? A Book for the People. By WASHINGTON GLADDEN. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1891. 16mo, pp. iv., 381, \$1.25.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT. By the Rev. CHARLES H. H. WRIGHT, D.D., Ph.D., Bampton Lecturer (1878), Donnellan Lecturer (1880-81), Examiner in Hebrew, etc., University of London. (Theological Educator Series.) New York: Whittaker, 1890. 12mo, pp. xvi., 226, 75 cents net.

STUMBLING STONES REMOVED FROM THE WORD OF GOD. By ARTHUR T. PIERSON. New York: Baker & Taylor Co., 1891. 18mo, pp. 82, cloth, 50 cents.

IT IS WRITTEN. A careful study of the Gospels as to all the words and acts of our Lord and other things contained therein touching the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament. By THOMAS SCOTT BACON, D.D. New York: Ketcham, 1891. 12mo, pp. 111.

These titles represent some of the recent literature on both sides of one of the prominent questions of the day, though it must be confessed that the scholarship in this list is painfully on one side. It is a significant feature that so many of these books and such a proportion of others in the same field are addressed to a popular audience. The volumes of Wildeboer and Wright are intended for pastors and theological students, to whom a brief compendious statement will be welcome. While scholarly they do not pretend to be exhaustive. They are calculated to be of service to those who wish aid at the threshold or who desire to gain a rapid survey of the field in question. The other five volumes are popular in purpose and treatment, being intended to instruct the average intelligent layman, and represent four denominations, two professors and three ministers being the authors.

Professor Wildeboer presents us with a virtual second edition of his book, this time in German dress, in the hope that it will reach a wider circle

of readers than was possible to the Dutch edition. The wish which Professor Cheyne expressed with regard to the former edition may be repeated in regard to this one, that it might come before the public also in English form. The object of the writer is to present a tenable view of the process by which the Old Testament canon took its shape and the principles which guided therein. It is of immense importance to know what the Jewish conception of canonicity was. We are apt to apply the word without question always in the sense which it bears in our vocabulary to-day, rather than to inquire what the notion of the ancients was. So long as we regard the Old Testament canon from our own standpoint, so long will we fail to grasp the true relation and significance of the Old Testament. It is also not without significance that the canon was not absolutely fixed in all three divisions for the Jews till in the neighborhood of 200 A.D. (cf. p. 67). The process of canonization seems to have been rather one of weeding out than of inserting. The pre-eminent position of the Pentateuch was such that it was the norm, and the question of canonicity was resolved into the question whether a later writing was in accord therewith (p. 90). Admission to the Jewish canon was then conditioned by agreement with the "Law," and as a whole the sacred writings are called by that name in John x. 34, xii. 34, xv. 25, 1 Cor. xiv. 21. That which had relation to classic times or which purported to come from an ancient author seems finally to have been admitted to the canon, though such books as "Wisdom," though full of reverence for the "Law," and 1 Maccabees, which contains a veritable and important account of a later period of Jewish history, were excluded apparently merely because they were the works of known late writers. At the same time it is instructive to note that the discussions of Jewish scholars as to the canonicity of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, and Esther, continued into the second century of our era.

Of course this book contains much which will be far from satisfactory to all such as have a fear lest the "higher critics" shall succeed actually in oversetting the very ark of God. These results, however, are not based upon the conclusions of literary criticism, but are rather strictly historical in their character and consequently more forceful for that very fact.

The title of Professor Thayer's volume stands for a fact. It is becoming more and more evident that the change is here and that it affects not only the professors and scholars of Germany, but many of the professors of this land and a considerable proportion of the clergy and not a few of the laity. These are not satisfied with tradition as their main guide. Jewish rabbinical fables have long enough obscured the truth. Mediaeval dogmatism and its modern representatives have lost their power to compel assent, and *a priori* reasoning is to be brought face to face with the actual facts. But by a strange sort of logic those who try to remove the barnacle-like accretions are often suspected of harboring the intention of scuttling the ship. How false such a suspicion is will be evident to the reader of this little essay. The thesis of Professor Thayer is that the theology of to-day has "laid a disproportionate emphasis on the full and final character of Scripture teaching relative to the whole range of speculation and conduct, life and destiny." The claims of this "exaggerated theory" are tested by consideration of the circumstances in which the New Testament

originated and the theory's definition and proportion. "Word of" application of scholar at v. pressive of t. the contrary simply in co. Bible to the itself." It is to learn just are met by re. derived their their position claiming to b. of the Bible traditionalist peace becau their points for the latter arrogate all their oppone and their co the common. This little bo which shoul to the other. not harsh o. esty, convic sound.

Professor order the pr upon religio the suspicio devout and denunciation alike, as " fed by state in Scripture inspiration] critics have far as their they are de are accused inspiration. It is reassu take up a Here are su most widel whether we is well to the final ou should pro Will the su her light? any compen

Briefly a that the Bi absolutely since God innerrant in is all that learn its co this "roy Henceforth the precep conform to regard this particular the Word But what the Bible arrive at th The views

originated and its intrinsic characteristics, the theory's defiance of the law of historic sequence and proportion, the misuse of the biblical term "Word of God," the impossibility of consistent application of the theory, the fact that it sets the scholar at variance with the Christian, and is repressive of the spiritual life of the Church. On the contrary, the "change of view" "consists simply in conforming our opinion respecting the Bible to the undoubted properties of the book itself." It is passing strange that those who desire to learn just what the Bible witnesses as to itself are met by rebuff and reproach by those who have derived their ideas from tradition, or who support their position upon *a priori* considerations while claiming to be the only true friends and defenders of the Bible. Between the higher critics and traditionalists or dogmatists there can be no peace because of the fundamental difference in their points of departure and their methods. But for the latter, with their rationalistic procedure, to arrogate all right to themselves and to denounce their opponents, and deny their Christian character and their common honesty, is a perversion which the common sense of men will not long tolerate. This little book of Professor Thayer is a bugle-note which should be echoed from one end of the land to the other. It is decided in its tone and yet it is not harsh or discordant. It has the ring of honesty, conviction and truth, giving no uncertain sound.

Professor Sanday's book is an attempt to set in order the probable results of criticism in its effect upon religion. It is the effort of a scholar to allay the suspicions and to quiet the fears entertained by devout and pious persons in view of the sweeping denunciation of all critics, reverent and irreverent alike, as "destructive." Their fears have been fed by statements such as this: "A proved error in Scripture contradicts not only our doctrine [of inspiration], but the Scripture's claims. . . ." The critics have declared that there are errors there so far as their present knowledge goes, and therefore they are denounced as worse than infidels. They are accused not only of attempting to disprove inspiration, but of overthrowing "our" doctrine. It is reassuring in the midst of such turmoil to take up a book like this by Professor Sanday. Here are summed up some truths that should be most widely received and pondered. No matter whether we agree with him in all points or not, it is well to have such testimony. What is to be the final outcome, even if all which the critics claim should prove true? Shall we lose our Bible? Will the sun be darkened and the moon withdraw her light? What loss will there be, and is there any compensating gain?

Briefly and baldly stated, the old position was that the Bible is the Word of God, and as such is absolutely authoritative in all its parts, because, since God is its author, it must be infallible and inerrant in its entirety. If this is so a concordance is all that we need to prosecute its study and to learn its commands. But the critics have rendered this "royal road" difficult, if not impossible. Henceforth the principle must take the place of the precept, and principles are notably harder to conform to than precepts are to obey. Those who regard this as a loss confess a preference for the particular command above the systematic study of the Word which eventuates in broad principles. But what are the gains? The first is in *truth*. If the Bible is true, by means of its study we shall arrive at the truth in regard to it and its teachings. The views which finally obtain will be true views.

Devotion to the Bible would dictate that we dismiss prepossessions and prejudices, and allow it to speak for itself without interference. The second is in *security*. That which has been fully tested will stand. There is no danger that the essentials will perish even if human dogmatic structures are swept away and obliterated. The third is in *reality*. The relation between life and teaching in Scripture is vital, not formal, and the life informed by a true view of God's dealing with men will conform to the purpose of God. But suppose that it be admitted that the Bible is not inerrant in all its statements, how can it be used? Much as heretofore. No legitimate use of Scripture will be discontinued, but there will be added a method which will have more of real contact with human life, because it will be constructed in accordance with the actual dealings of God with men in the past. This method makes God a real and moving factor in human life instead of a being who has spoken in the Bible once for all. There are some who regard the change as entirely a gain, with no real loss whatever.

The volumes of Drs. Gladden and Wright are similar in their aim, though the difference in the classes whom they address has caused a decided difference in the treatment. The former presents an "Introduction" suited to the intelligent Christian who is interested to know what the truth may be. It is the more adapted to meet its purpose, since it is the result of the labors of specialists filtered through the mind of one who does not claim that distinction, but who is able to state the salient facts in a way which makes the subject plain to the average reader. This has been done in an admirable manner, and the book is a valuable addition to the popular literature of the subject. Considering the audience in view, it may be questioned whether the author is always wise in his denunciation of old views. A statement of the facts, allowing them to speak for themselves, would arouse less antagonism and would facilitate the acceptance of the truth. Intolerance is bad anywhere, but to adopt the enemy's weapon is inadvisable in religious matters.

Dr. Wright's book should be in the hands of every minister and every theological student. It is a valuable addition to our growing Old Testament literature. It is abreast of the progressive Christian scholarship of the day, and it presents the facts as ordinarily accepted in a plain and succinct fashion. It does not go to the lengths of extreme criticism, but is rather conservative than radical in its statements. The avowed purpose of the volume has been achieved, "to give the ascertained results of modern criticism within very confined limits." The amount of material packed into these 226 pages is quite beyond expectation, and yet in spite of condensation the treatment is clear and the statements lucid and comprehensive.

Dr. Pierson's book is that of an apologist who is none too consistent with himself, of an exegete who grasps at an explanation all too easily if it offers plausible means of escape from a difficulty, of a dogmatist who takes liberties which he denies to others, of an advocate anxious to establish his cause. It might almost have been written, *mutatis mutandis*, by a Mohammedan in reference to the Koran. It is suggested that where the New Testament writers quote from the Septuagint a text which differs from the Hebrew, "The Spirit guided them so to do, in order to bring more clearly to view the inspired meaning of sacred words"—that is, a later inspiration corrected its former infallible words, which contained error or

failed to convey the meaning which inspiration intended (cf. p. 40). The method of procedure in connection with 1 Cor. vii. 40 (p. 24) is somewhat startling, where Paul, "instead of disclaiming inspiration," "rather affirms with peculiar emphasis the apostolic warrant for his instruction." It is denied to others to pronounce judgment as to what is "circumstantial" in the biblical record and what is "essential," and yet the same right is exercised when we are told that Scripture is not affected "materially" by the "hundreds of thousands of variations" in the text; "not one essential truth is in the slightest modified" (p. 62). The book as a whole is an example of the lengths to which a man will go in order to support a preconceived theory. "Current popular phraseology, which is known to be scientifically inaccurate, may find its way into the Bible simply as a prevailing *idiom of speech*" (p. 52), and yet "Moses in the Law" is an absolute and authoritative assertion that Moses wrote the Pentateuch.

In line with this last statement is the whole book of Dr. Bacon. The fundamental assumption of this book is that the Scriptures existed at the beginning of our era just as we have them now, being "such in their various titles, divisions, and apparent chronology." This is the fundamental position, with which is coupled another assumption which is not expressed, but which is necessary to the completeness of the argument, that Moses wrote the Pentateuch and that it never was changed, altered, or "edited" afterward. To have stated it would have rendered the book unnecessary, and have offered no opportunity for the abuse of the "Higher Critics." But abuse of the "higher criticism" can scarcely establish these fundamental theses. No doubt the name is unfortunate. "Higher" is arrogant, and "criticism" applied to the Word of God sounds preposterous and presumptuous, if not blasphemous. But is any one justified by the facts in saying that the "new theory" "is evidently *not* the work of very devout souls, . . . but rather of mere literary ambition and eagerness to find anything new to oppose to traditional beliefs" (p. 92.) Is it really correct to say that the higher criticism is one of the "works of the Devil" (pp. 98-99.) The author is careless in his diction, while in his logic, in his assertions, in his assumptions, and in his conclusions much is to be desired.

CHARLES R. GILLET.

NEW YORK.

THE APOCALYPSE: ITS STRUCTURE AND PRIMARY PREDICTIONS. By DAVID BROWN, D.D., Principal of the Free Church College, Aberdeen. New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1891. 12mo, pp.xl., 224. \$1.25.

A book, or "booklet," as the author modestly terms it, written by a man in his eighty-eight year, is remarkable on that account. Principal Brown, in his preface, tells how he was led to prepare it, and his purpose in doing so. He calls it repeatedly "an A B C" of the Apocalypse. It is neither a commentary nor a discussion of the Second Advent, but simply a series of articles on the authenticity (or genuineness), date, and design of the Apocalypse, and then a theory of the structure of the book, illustrated by exposition of such parts of it as may serve to maintain the theory of interpretation upheld by the author. Hence, the little volume is all the more remarkable for the self-denying effort it indicates, the effort to omit what was not essential for the announced purpose.

Principal Brown, as is generally known, pub-

lished a book on the Second Advent nearly fifty years ago. In the present volume he maintains very much the same positions he then stated. But it would seem that the chief motive for this little work was a desire to oppose that theory of interpretation which is now applied by many English and Scotch writers to the Apocalypse. The author's townsman, Professor Milligan, has done much to disseminate the "ethical" or "spiritual" view of the Book of Revelation, virtually denying its predictive character, that is, so far as detailed reference to future events is involved. Principal Brown not only regards it as predictive, but, accepting the continuously historical theory of interpretation, feels able to point with some confidence to certain events as fulfillments of the predictions. That this is done with less detail than is usual in such works is owing partly to the limited purpose of the volume and partly to the author's views of the millennium.

Taking up the several parts, we find about thirty-five pages of "Introduction," discussing the authorship of the book, which is held to be Johannine; the date, which is placed in the reign of Domitian; and the design, as has been indicated in the preceding paragraph. For myself I am glad to find this veteran expositor defending the later date of the Apocalypse (in the reign of Domitian). It alone has external evidence to support it; and the internal grounds adduced for the earlier date still seem to me insufficient proof. The difference of style, of which so much is made, is not inconsistent with the later date. It is precisely an *old* man, wrapt in apocalyptic vision, who would revert at once to the idiom of his youth, the rougher Hebraistic style of a Palestinian Jew. Principal Brown adds a number of arguments, drawn mainly from the characteristics of the book itself, against the early date. In his discussion of the design of the Apocalypse the author criticises Professor Milligan very keenly, and does not fail to refer to the preposterous statement of Professor Harnack (*Encyclopædia Britannica*, article *Revelation*) "that the Apocalypse is the most intelligible book of the New Testament." The Introduction closes with an *addendum*, in which a paragraph penned by Sir William Hamilton is shown to be untrustworthy in its statements. Principal Brown seems to enjoy this piece of work. In these days, when so many specialists in other matters undertake to lay down the law for biblical scholars, it is worth while noticing how utterly misleading and inaccurate so great a man as Sir William Hamilton can become when he deals with questions out of his department. *Ne auctor ultra crepidum* has its application to some very distinguished people.

Contending for the artistic structure of the Apocalypse, the venerable author most correctly recognizes the part of the "chorus" or "song" in the arrangement of the matter. "When any of the great epochal events is to occur, it is first announced in a burst of song, or similar form, the details of all that lead up to it being reserved for subsequent disclosures" (p. 79). Richard Wagner might have written this as the true theory of a great musical work. The attempt to find seven series of sevens in the book is not made by Principal Brown. He thinks the seven seals cover the whole period of prophetic disclosure, but does not regard the seven trumpets and vials as strictly synchronous with the seals; they are rather subdivisions. Between these he finds explanatory visions with a symbolism of their own. Having made this explanation, he proceeds to take up such details as illustrate his view. While there is no

extended
and ag
ments.
most
papa
time"
years,
"The
Rome.
others,
refers
the wi
The en
tion p
The
discuss
passag
regard
that in
is no
Only
tions i

In th
matter
strictu
Hort.
sion.
as a
most
can r
correct

The
not so
works
quain
printe

It i
when
ly to s
repres
have
"cont
he wh
lyse
torio,
than
tive;
soluti
ume,
somet
this p
recom
lyse

WE
GHEN

THE
By
"T
"T
Wo
& S

This
gives
vario
"The
"The
script
Lord
Threa
ing V
Par
Lev. 1

extended exegetical treatment, the foot-notes again and again introduce critical and grammatical comments. As might be expected, the author finds the most prominent predictions those which refer to papal Rome. The "time, and times, and half a time" (chap. xii. 14) are regarded as = 1260 years, during which papal Rome is dominant. "The beast" is not one of the emperors, but papal Rome. The 666 puzzle, as read by Harnack and others, he makes light of. The two witnesses he refers to the Holy Spirit dwelling in true believers, the wilderness being the high Alps, Savoy, etc. The end of the 1260 years is fixed at the Reformation period.

The vexed question of the "thousand years" is discussed quite fully, and the literal sense of the passage denied. Not only is the Second Advent regarded as post-millennial, but the author states that in the strictly prophetic part of the book there is no distinct reference to the Second Advent. Only in the preliminary and supplementary portions is this great event announced.

In the Addenda Principal Brown includes some matter omitted from its proper place, and also a stricture upon the Greek text of Westcott and Hort. Still he usually prefers the Revised Version. In one place he objects to the word "devils" as a rendering of the Greek *daimones*, but, like most British authors, fails to notice that the American revisers insist (in their Appendix) upon the correct rendering.

The style of the book is characteristic, though not so brusque as some of the author's previous works. Age seems to have mellowed it into a quaint *naïveté*. The little volume is handsomely printed, and will bear careful study.

It is possible that at some time in the future, when the drama of earth has progressed sufficiently to show the full significance of this symbolical representation of it—it is possible that then we may have a consistent and correct exposition of the "continuously historical" theory; but until then he who would profit most by reading the Apocalypse will be wise in regarding it as a great "oratorio," musical rather than pictorial, poetical rather than chronological, practical rather than predictive; so regarding it, one can derive not only consolation, but joy from the perusal. Even this volume, with its detailed interpretation, recognizes something of the character indicated above. It is this poetic insight in Principal Brown which most recommends him as an interpreter of the Apocalypse in the judgment of the present writer.

M. B. RIDDLE.

WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, ALLEGHENY, PA.

THE BOOK OF LEVITICUS (EXPOSITOR'S BIBLE).

By the Rev. S. H. KELLOGG, D.D., author of "The Jews; or, Prediction and Fulfilment," "The Light of Asia and the Light of the World," etc. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1891. 8vo, pp. viii., 566, \$1.50.

This work is divided into three parts: Part I. gives the exposition of the law concerning the various offerings and institutions connected with "The Tabernacle Worship;" Part II. expounds "The Law of the Daily Life," including the descriptions of the Set Feasts and Seasons of the Lord; Part III. includes "The Promises and Threats of the Covenant" and the law "Concerning Vows."

Part I. opens with an introductory chapter on Lev. i. 1, which presents the origin, authority, pur-

pose, and present-day use of Leviticus. In regard to *origin*, the author appeals, as some others have done before him, to the words of Christ, and appears to hold that our Lord definitely intended to teach the Mosaic authorship of the book. He does indeed, both in this chapter and elsewhere (pp. 256, 419), allow the claim of editorial redaction, and the view of Delitzsch in his later years is referred to if not with approval, at least with hospitality; but the theory which makes the codification of any appreciable number of the laws the work of priests in the time of Ezra is regarded as a denial of the religion established by Jesus Christ. It does not seem to me wise to risk so much as this upon the correctness of the author's interpretation of the New Testament passages. Indeed it is well said by Professor C. H. H. Wright (in his Introduction to the Old Testament, p. viii.), "The [Graf-Wellhausen] theory does not necessarily make the Pentateuch a mere fabrication of designing priests." The *purpose* of Leviticus is said to be to teach Israel the way of holiness and the need of redeeming mercy, and to show "the typical correspondence between the Levitical ritual and New Testament facts." Its *present-day* use lies in its admirable system of civil laws and in the fact that it contains by means of its "divinely chosen illustrations" a revelation of Christ. In the exposition of the various offerings, Dr. Kellogg gives the primary meaning of the passages, the spiritual lessons, and the applications to characteristics of the work of Christ. His view, in general, is that while all the animal offerings "foreshadowed the death of Christ as an expiation for our sins" (p. 94), this was the chief purpose of the sin-offering alone, in which "an appointed substitutionary victim" (p. 141) is the type of "the great Victim" who "bore our sins" and was "visibly laden with the curse of God" (p. 153). There are very few prescriptions in which the author cannot find a spiritual meaning, and later Scriptures are made the key to the interpretation, the mere allusion of subsequent passages being sometimes regarded as giving the true explanation of the original; e.g., "in that frankincense was to be added to the meal-offering it is signified that this offering of the fruit of our labors to the Lord must ever be accompanied by prayer," and Ps. cxli. 2, Luke i. 10, Rev. v. 8, are quoted as very clear intimations of this meaning. Many will not be able to follow him when in the same connection they read that "in Holy Scripture heaven, without a single exception, is the established symbol of spiritual corruption" (p. 78), and they will think of Matt. xiii. 33 and other passages. The book of Leviticus is made very fruitful in types; and the author, while deprecating the confusion of "our own imaginings with the teaching of the Holy Ghost" in typology (p. 23), is certainly very skillful in following out the suggestions of the New Testament. For instance, he says, "We have seen the type of the day of atonement fulfilled in the entering into heaven of our Great High Priest; but in the type He came out again to bless the people—has that been fulfilled? Has He yet proclaimed absolute sin to guilty Israel? . . . And thus Leviticus bids us look forward to a glorious future yet to come, when the great redemption shall at last be accomplished." It is not easy to get a clear notion of what is included in our author's idea of a "type" throughout the work. Passing the paragraphs in which he makes the several offerings typical of Christ, each in its own way, it is said that "by this sin-offering not only Aaron and his son were cleansed, but we read that hereby atone-

ment was also made 'for the altar; a mysterious type, reminding us,' etc. (p. 306); the week's delay appointed to the leper before he could come into the presence of God is regarded as representing in type the delay between the acceptance of a sinner and the resurrection morning (p. 356); type and symbol seem to be confounded (p. 364), and both to mean scarcely more than suggestion (p. 365). When the author speaks of the propriety of making "vows" at the present time (p. 107) and of Christ's "unanswered prayer" (p. 144), I cannot agree with him.

The other parts are treated in much the same way. The second part is, perhaps, the most satisfactory work in the book, the exposition of "The Law of Holiness" (Lev. xviii. 20) being especially good.

The chief excellencies of the work seem to me to be the clear way in which the Levitical institutions are set before us, and the devout spirit which appears throughout all the pages. The principal defect is the tendency to find a more highly developed theology in Leviticus than the book itself or other Scripture seems to warrant.

CHARLES RUFUS BROWN.

THE NEWTON THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION.

LESSONS FROM THE LIVES OF THREE GREAT FATHERS. With Appendices. By WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1890. Small 8vo, pp. xxviii., 318, \$2.

This volume, from the pen of a well-known ecclesiastical historian, contains three popular and interesting lectures upon Athanasius, Chrysostom, and Augustine respectively, and a hundred and twenty-five pages of appendices illustrative of the life and influence of the Fathers mentioned, and of some of the controversies in which they were engaged.

The lectures, as their title indicates, are rather anecdotal than biographical. As such they are suggestive, and will doubtless help readers that are not themselves students of the Fathers, to a clearer conception of the characters and services of the three men.

In the main the author's estimates are just and his judgments discriminating. In his lecture upon Athanasius, however, he has fallen into the error, especially common among English writers, of representing the deity of Christ as the common faith of Christendom during the first three centuries, remarking that "the question then was whether this [viz., the adoration of "Christ as personally and literally divine"] should go on; whether it was defensible, or whether Christians were to reconsider their position and materially alter their way of thinking, feeling, and acting toward their Saviour. For if Arianism were true, this would become a religious duty for those who desired to keep the First Commandment." Taken with proper limitations this is true, but unqualified as it stands it is misleading, in that it makes no allowance for the wide prevalence during the second century within the Orthodox Church of one or another kind of adoptionism, a form of belief which, as we may gather from Hermas and from the anonymous writer quoted by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* v. 28), was the common view at least of the Roman Church from an early period until the time of Victor. The truth is that in some respects Arianism was less of an innovation than Professor Bright's words seem to imply, and that in that

fact lay something of its strength in its conflict with the developing Alexandrian Christology.

Beyond this we have no criticism to make upon the historical accuracy of the work.

ARTHUR C. MCGIFFERT.

LANE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, CINCINNATI.

EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY. Credibility and Inspiration of the New Testament Books. By J. W. MCGARVEY, A.M., Professor of Sacred History and Evidences in the College of the Bible, Kentucky University, Louisville: Guide Printing and Publishing Co., 1891. 8vo, pp. vi., 223, \$1.50.

The above volume embraces Part III. and Part IV. of a work on the evidences of Christianity, of which the first two parts, treating of the integrity of the New Testament text and the genuineness of the New Testament books, were published five years ago in a volume which "met with such a reception from the public as to encourage the author to continue the work; and he had progressed so far with it as to have written a large portion of part third, when a fire, which laid his dwelling in ruins, consumed his manuscript, together with all the notes and references which he had accumulated." All intelligent readers and students, and especially those engaged in literary production, will appreciate what such a trial must involve, and will extend to the author their heartiest sympathy, while they will now congratulate him on the replacement of the lost material, and the final completion of the work.

In the present volume Part III., which occupies 167 pages, relates to the credibility of the New Testament books, and Part IV., which occupies 52 pages, to their inspiration. The work is intended for beginners, and is prepared with especial reference to class-room instruction in high schools and colleges. "It does not, therefore, attempt to exhaust the subject." The book should in fairness be judged according to this modest limitation of its aim.

A corresponding limitation meets us in our author's sources, which are restricted apparently to the English language, his references to foreign authorities, e.g., Strauss, Baur, Renan, being to the translations of their works. For the immediate purpose in view the author's equipment may be pronounced to be fairly sufficient, although a fuller acquaintance with the results of the best exegetical and literary criticism of the New Testament now accessible even in English in the works of Meyer, Reuss, Weiss, would have served to enrich his material for illustration, to correct occasional one-sidedness of representation, and especially to furnish a more scientific point of view for the apologetic treatment of certain classes of difficulties in the New Testament books.

An example may be found in his application of Rawlinson's canons of historical criticism to the evangelists. Following the traditional view respecting the composition of the Gospels, he groups Matthew and John together under the first canon as "eye-witnesses of nearly all the events they record, and therefore as 'having the highest degree of credibility';" Mark and Luke under the second canon as "writers who were not eye-witnesses, but wrote what had been narrated to them," and as therefore "possessing the second degree of credibility." But literary criticism shows that this distinction is illusory. As a matter of fact, the basal record of Mark, the "Proto-Mark," as clearly falls under Canon I. as the "Proto-Mat-

thew.
conce
Gosp
Gosp
tradit
the g
dence
titled
as the
Matth
In l
cism
impos
credib
and t
The
books
liver
This
can b
bilit
devia
Obvi
of cr
histo
from
dictio
out
given
even
same
Test
to do
ticult
Far
strik
that
the
cinc
more
cove
ords
espe
deta
sour
B
of t
the
only
pro
plex
sult
all
lute
illog
vici
ten
rest
min
giv
den
sect
rep
ind
the
sac
sup
part
it v
any
con
var
rall
say
sus

them." Whereas so far as the final redaction is concerned, the evidence goes to show that each Gospel falls under Canon II. The titles of our Gospels, it is well known, are purely a matter of tradition; and we have good reason to believe, on the ground both of tradition and of internal evidence, that the second Gospel is quite as well entitled to be called the Gospel according to Peter, as the first to be called the Gospel according to Matthew.

In like manner the conclusions of literary criticism respecting the structure of the Gospels are important in their bearing on the question of their credibility as affected by their internal variations, and the difficulties which these variations present. The claim of credibility for the New Testament books is one which, of course, every devout believer in Christianity will emphatically maintain. This is fundamental to every other claim which can be made in their behalf. But does this credibility require the affirmation of absolute and undeviating harmony in every minute particular? Obviously not in itself considered. No such test of credibility is applied in the examination of other historical testimony. Where testimony comes from various sources, minor variations, and contradictions even, are looked for, and accepted without disturbance to our faith in honest testimony given by honest men. The absence of them would even in most cases be deemed suspicious. The same may be said of the credibility of the New Testament books. To admit discrepancies is not to deny the general credibility nor even the particular credibility and verisimilitude of the record. Far otherwise. The roots of the record clearly strike down into the facts. It is absolutely certain that the great multitude of the details are from the life; and no line of investigation is more fascinating in itself, more striking in its results, or more welcome to the believing heart than the discovery of "undesigned coincidences" in the records. The same may be said of the formal and especially the incidental confirmation of historic details in the New Testament from external sources.

But the question throughout is one of fact, not of theory. And, so regarded, our examination of the history and building, not of the written text only, but of the original record, the channels and processes through which it passed, and the complexity, in a relative sense at least, of the final result, makes it apparent that the attempt to force all the variant statements of the record into absolute and specific harmony in every detail is at once illogical, unhistoric, and vain. It establishes a vicious method of procedure, it starts from an untenable premise and it aims at an impracticable result. It exerts a prejudicial influence on the mind of the critic. Instead of leaving him free to give to each separate source its full and independent value, its distinct historic sense, and so to secure a living historic variety and fulness in the representation, it tends to blunt and to deaden the individualities of the specific factors, and to force the entire record into a mechanical uniformity, sacrificing its life, spontaneity, and freedom to a superficial regularity and consistency. While each part of the record reflects its light on other parts, it would be an unwarranted procedure to subject any one part to undue pressure from the rest; to constrain, *e.g.*, a meaning on what Mark says, at variance with that which his statement would naturally yield, for no other reason than that Matthew says this or that. As Caesar's wife must be above suspicion, so the interpreter of Scripture must be

not only honest, but above the suspicion of dishonesty.

My space forbids more than a brief reference to the discussion of inspiration. On this subject Professor McGarvey proceeds on lines of his own, and is to be distinctly commended for his scriptural as distinguished from the dogmatic treatment of the subject. There are not wanting fresh and suggestive hints, and here and there he seems to be on the point of emerging into a broad and vital apprehension of the central reality which, as it differentiates the fact, should dominate our statement and treatment of inspiration. Thus on the differences between the Hebrew and the Septuagint in New Testament citations, he judiciously remarks, after giving some examples: "In all these instances the writers followed the version which they constantly read, without knowing perhaps that it differed from the Hebrew, just as scholars at the present day often quote from our English version without stopping to inquire whether it is accurate or not. Even if Luke, Stephen, or Paul had stopped to inquire which text was correct in the places cited, it is not at all probable that they could have decided the question by their unaided powers. It is clear that the Holy Spirit could have guided them, as it did other writers in other instances, to follow the Hebrew instead of the Greek text; and it follows from the fact that he did not, that he desired the facts to be stated as the people read them in their Bibles, rather than to raise questions of textual criticism among a people unprepared for such investigations." An extension of the logic of that passage is almost all that would be needed to meet the objections to "the essential theory" of inspiration, of which, however, his statement is hardly adequate, any more than the refutation is conclusive.

Making due allowance for such limitations and exceptions as have been noted, it remains to say that the author has executed the task which he has set before himself with conscientious thoroughness and acuteness. He also shows throughout a commendable spirit of candor, fairness in the statement of the difficulties to be removed, an earnest desire to ascertain the truth, as well as zeal in maintaining it. It may also be granted without reserve that in many particulars the discussion is satisfactory, the solution of difficulties reasonable, and the answer to objections conclusive.

A careful index would have much added to the value of the book as a manual for instruction.

LL. J. EVANS.

LANE SEMINARY, CINCINNATI.

HEGEL'S LOGIC. A Book on the Genesis of the Categories of the Mind. A Critical Exposition. By WILLIAM T. HARRIS, LL.D., United States Commissioner of Education. (German Philosophical Classics for English Readers and Students.) Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co., 1890. 16mo, pp. xxx., 403.

Idealism, considered as the attempt to develop philosophically the insight that the world is constituted by mind, and not by atoms or blind force, is unquestionably "the truth" or inner principle of the history of European speculation. Hegelianism is, in a sort, the culmination of this movement. What others had succeeded in showing imperfectly Hegel undertook to demonstrate. He sought to deduce scientifically the necessity of conceiving the ultimate principle as spiritual, and of the world as its manifestation. His aim was not merely to assert the identity of subject and ob-

ject, but to comprehend its possibility. Every partial idealism was to be transcended and objective and absolute idealism forever established—an idealism not rising to the clouds by suppressing experience, but keeping firm footing in the world by comprehending it. The common opinion now is that Hegel failed. His "identities," it is said, are merely analogies. His logical "negativity," the *nieus* of the dialectic, is only "negatively related" to real opposition. His *a priori* deductions are borrowed from experience. His "ballet of notions" does not represent the actual play of living energies in the world. This and much more is objected by many who have studied Hegel: what is said against him by those who have not would fill volumes. Meanwhile his system remains, the most imposing monument of pure speculation ever constructed by the mind of man. Its attractions are perennial. So are its difficulties.

Dr. Harris has both studied Hegel and believes in him. He has already done more than any other man in this country to make Hegel understood. And it has been pre eminently a labor of love. "Philosophy bakes no bread." He has chosen for his exposition here the most difficult part of the system, the metaphysical groundwork. The result is a very serviceable chart of the whole system, together with much needed help in detail in the interpretation of Hegel's provokingly elusive thought and exasperating terminology. That Dr. Harris always interprets his author correctly would probably be allowed by no independent student of Hegel besides Dr. Harris himself. The candid critic will, however, concede much to the obscurity of the subject. The five chapters (iv.-viii.) analyzing the *Phenomenology*—an awful labyrinth even to the most resolute of readers—should prove especially valuable. So, too, should the analysis of Hegel's "Begriff" (c. xiii.), which, in its distinction from the "Idea," is regarded as "the most important aperçu" of the logic (p. x.). All the vexed questions of metaphysics come up for discussion, and there is no possibility of making the discussion easy. Attention may be called especially to the chapters relating to the finite and the infinite (xvii.-xxi.) and to that on the syllogism (xxx.), as containing the results of much independent thinking.

The most important divergence from Hegel regards the doctrine of the Trinity. It is represented as follows: Hegel thinks that nature is the direct object of the absolute; in reality it is mediated through the consciousness of the Logos, and is, metaphysically considered, the *processio* of the Holy Spirit (p. xiv. f., chap. i.). But Dr. Harris does not make his doctrine intelligible. His identification of the consciousness of the Logos of his "eternal generation" and distinction from the Father with the creation of time and space is arbitrary. And so with all subsequent stages of the process of the "return" to self-consciousness. The wealth of individual existences is unaccounted for, even if we allow the reality of the universals. The world cannot be deduced that way. The dialectical development of the categories may be conceivable; the derivation of individuality and sensuous matter from pure thought, never. In proposing such a construction, we pass over from insight to dogma. H. N. GARDINER.

SMITH COLLEGE, NORTHAMPTON, MASS.

A BRIEF COMMENTARY ON THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT FOR STUDY AND DEVOTION. By F. W. STELLHORN, Professor of Theology in Capital University, Columbus, O. Vol I. The

Gospels. Columbus: The Lutheran Book Concern, 1891. 8vo, pp. xi., 348. Cloth, \$2; half leather, \$2.50; morocco, \$3.

This exposition is intended both for the clergy and the laity, to aid the former in searching the Scriptures, and the latter in conducting household worship. These two objects are not often combined in the same work, and the author's preface suggests a doubt whether at times one has not been sacrificed to the other. It seems to us that he has succeeded as well as could be expected. His method is to take a longer or shorter pericope, which is printed at length from the Common Version, and follow it by a summary explanation, critical remarks on words and phrases being given in the shape of notes at the bottom of the page. At the close of each chapter is a collect or short prayer, breathing the true spirit of humble, earnest devotion.

The explanations are in the main sensible and evangelical, yet might have been more satisfactory without encroaching upon the prescribed limits. For instance, the reader is not told that the phrase, often recurring in the fifth chapter of Matthew, "It was said by them of old time," should be rendered "to them of old time." Thus one misses a number of the nicer points of exposition which are now substantially settled. But so far as the author does go, his remarks are both correct and useful. He is faithful to the standards of his own church, insisting (p. 111), in regard to the institution of the Eucharist, that "only he who comes to these words with the preconceived notion that it is not possible for Christ to give His body to eat and His blood to drink, will understand them in any other than the literal sense." All the rest of the Protestant world are of a different opinion. It is proper to add that Dr. Stellhorn, commenting upon the strong expressions in John vi. 58, declares that the eating and drinking here spoken of cannot be that which takes place in the Lord's Supper (1) because Christ makes it necessary to salvation (v. 53), and (2) because He represents it as always and necessarily salutary (v. 54); neither of which can be said of the partaking of the supper, while both can and must be said of the appropriation of Christ's vicarious life and death by faith. This is certainly very well put.

On the whole, the work will prove itself an acceptable addition to the popular expositions of the Word, especially to the people of the large and influential Lutheran body. It will be completed in two similar octavo volumes, one comprising Acts, Romans, and Corinthians, the other the rest of the New Testament. T. W. CHAMBERS.

NEW YORK.

CHRISTIANITY IN RELATION TO SCIENCE AND MORALS. By MALCOLM MACCOLL, M.A., Canon Residentiary of Ripon and Rector of St. George's, city of London. New York: James Pott & Co., 1890. [Third edition.] Pp. liv., 346, \$1.75.

It becomes necessary, every now and then, in the progress of theology, as well as of any other science, to take a survey of the existing situation and see what have been the absolute gains. This gives rise to two classes of literary work—one endeavoring to weave into a consistent whole the elements of the science, in a new and improved manner, and which is necessarily *ad clerum*—i.e., intended for those who follow everything back to first principles more or less persistently; and the other *ad populum*, in which the endeavor is to make the same apprehensible for the common mind

by clear s
This work
originally
the congre

Both the
getic work
This pres
have organ
mentary.
there is on
up. In vi
the Holy S
His reveal
receive th
office in th
Church ca

But for
range this
author is
ing very c
admitted
is evident
by any bi
statement
vindicates
wrong co
about res
normal.
are prese
made cle
heresies w
Christian
against s
way he d
dential gu
less a cer
ment had
cal scienc
to human

In tren
conceptio
science p
satisfact
Christ.
from the
soul-dete
creation i
tice to t
Lord wa
though
think, to
clearly c
Atoneme
Jesus' do
That H
die.
It is to
these le
satisfact

SEABO

Theolo
R. A. L
atur des
bearbeit
(Brauns
tav E.
worth o
has any
gether
as poss
review

by clear statement and appropriate illustrations. This work is of the latter class, and its content was originally in the form of lectures delivered before the congregation of Ripon Cathedral.

Both these classes of works have their apologetic worth for their different classes of readers. This present book, therefore, cannot be said to have organic completeness, and may seem fragmentary. Indeed, even for his immediate auditors there is one hiatus which ought to have been filled up. In vindicating the doctrine of the Godhead, the Holy Spirit, as a necessity of thought, or even His revealed relation to Father and Son, does not receive the needful treatment; and hence His office in the economical relations of the Christian Church cannot be made out.

But for its immediate content and within its range this book is eminently successful. The author is an accomplished writer, makes his meaning very clear, and illustrates it felicitously from admitted facts of science and history. His mind is evidently open to all new truth, and unclouded by any bigotry. Hence he is not given to overstatement or to needless dogmatism, and yet he vindicates the need of dogma by showing that wrong conceptions in theology inevitably bring about results in human character which are abnormal. The fundamental postulates of theology are presented in very attractive form, and it is made clear that the tendency of all the great heresies was to narrow, not enlarge, the extent of Christian belief, and that the creeds were protests against such diminution. In a very interesting way he demonstrates that there has been a Providential guiding in human progress, and that unless a certain degree of moral and religious attainment had preceded the great discoveries of physical science, the latter would have been destructive to human welfare.

In treating of the question of the miraculous conception of Jesus, he notices the analogies which science presents, but we cannot think that he deals satisfactorily with the doctrine of the Person of Christ. It is not noticed that even in His descent from the female parent he must have received *soul-determinations*. The doctrine of the new creation may be held so abstractly as to do injustice to the doctrine of *traduction*, and that our Lord was a true member of the human race, even though born *into* it, rather than *out* of it. We think, too, that the need of Christ's death is not clearly enough displayed to lift the doctrine of Atonement beyond the charge of arbitrariness. Jesus' death, though voluntary, was yet necessary. That He could suffer *pain* showed that he *must* die.

It is to be hoped that the author will supplement these lectures by others, giving the whole more satisfactory completeness.

J. STEINFORT KEDNEY.

SEABURY DIVINITY SCHOOL, FARIBAULT, MINN.

BRIEF REVIEWS, BY THE EDITOR.

Theologischer Jahresbericht. Herausgegeben von R. A. Lipsius. Zehnter Band enthaltend die Literatur des Jahres 1890. Erste Abtheilung: *Exegese*; bearbeitet von Carl Siegfried und H. Holtzmann. (Braunschweig: Schwetschke; New York: Gustav E. Stechert, 1891, pp. 1-116.) Truly the worth of this volume is great to those to whom it has any worth at all. It is an attempt to get together a large number and as complete a collection as possible of the titles of books, pamphlets, and review articles upon subjects belonging to the

various branches of theological science. With them are coupled short incisive notices of many of the books mentioned in the lists. The brevity of many notices is sometimes provoking, but as they are made by acknowledged authorities in the various branches, one is enabled to get a fair idea of a book or article. One limitation is to be noted, that the critics have not seen all of the books in the list. But despite this, the classified catalogue is of great assistance, and enables one to look up a large part, if not the whole, of the literature of the year in very brief time. The continuation of the series to the tenth volume is a fair guarantee of its usefulness and value. The present *Abtheilung* covers Exegetical Theology in all its parts, beginning with the philological aids and proceeding to the text, criticism, and exegesis of both Old and New Testaments. The following parts are to cover the other three main heads in the fourfold division of Theological Encyclopedia. It is worthy of note that the mention of American books and review articles is very full.

Prophecy and History in Relation to the Messiah. The Warburton Lectures for 1880-84, with two appendices on the arrangement, analysis, and recent criticism of the Pentateuch. By Alfred Edersheim, M.A., Oxon., D.D., Ph.D. Author's Edition. (New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co., pp. xxiv., 391.) This is a reprint of the twelve lectures published soon after the delivery of the last one, and apparently from the original plates. It does not seem necessary to say anything further about the book at this late day, than that the author's position is mainly opposed of that of Wellhausen and Kuenen. A considerable part of the volume is taken up with a refutation of their positions upon the Pentateuchal and other historical questions as to the Old Testament. Recognizing, however, that it is in the nature of things that criticism will clear away in some cases the alleged foundations of some of our traditional beliefs, the author says: "For the end is certain—not that full and free criticism may be suppressed, but that it may be utilized; that so on the evening of the battle there may be assured peace, and the golden light shine around the old truth in her new garments of conquest, revealing the full perfection of her beauty."

The Fleming H. Revell Company of New York and Chicago have continued their "Popular Vellum Series" by the addition of three neat little pamphlets (16mo, 32 pages each, 20 cents). The new issues are *The Fight of Faith and the Cost of Character*: Talks to Young Men, by Theodore L. Cuyler, D.D.; *Hope, the Last Thing in the World*, by Arthur T. Pierson, D.D.; and *How to Learn How*: Addresses—I. Dealing with Doubt; II. Preparation for Learning, by Henry Drummond, F.R.S.E., F.G.S. They are just what one would expect them to be, and are beyond praise.

QUARTERLY AND MAGAZINE REVIEWS.

CONTENTS PAGES AND DIGESTS OF THEIR PRINCIPAL ARTICLES.

CRITICISM VERSUS ECCLESIASTICISM. I. Criticism. By Rev. STEWART MEANS. *Andover Review*, September, 1891.

This is the first paper of a full and clear exposition of the two tendencies or modes of thought

which are becoming more and more evident as controlling the active spirits of the day. The old parties and schools, the author claims, are disappearing, and the lines of a new conflict are becoming apparent, with new standards, new weapons, and new battle cries.

Taking up, first, criticism, the author treats it historically, to prove his position that it can only be called modern in the sense that it is a great force in modern thought. In reality it is as old as Protestantism and the intellectual movement resulting in and expressed by the Reformation. That intellectual ferment aroused in Italy chiefly the love for classical studies; but in Germany it could only be contented with applying itself to the most serious and religious thought and study. For a long time its contest was most difficult. Its most ardent and successful scholars—Reuchlin, Erasmus, Budeus—were rejected by the universities which were in the power of the Church, and controversy too often took the place of scholarship, to the great sorrow of Melancthon and Luther. Still the leaders accomplished much, and were nobly followed by Scaliger and Casaubon, who enlarged upon the scholarship of Erasmus by adding the power of the critic. During this time scholarship was exclusively Protestant, but with less and less enthusiasm. Then came Bentley, with his claim that criticism could be a science, and be worked independently of tradition or prejudice, and could lead to results which could be tested by the severest rules of evidence. It is interesting that the work of Tischendorf, nearly one hundred and fifty years later, was based upon the method outlined by Bentley.

The influence of Bentley was felt most of all in Germany, where Lessing, Herder, and Goethe filled the land with new activity, and Kant inaugurated the great speculative and philosophical movement which has changed the theology and philosophy of the century. It was necessary that criticism should have something to criticise, and hence the value of the impulse given by Wolf and Niebuhr to the study of the ancient civilization. Investigation became the order of the day, and it was natural that the great world of Hebrew history should be drawn within its scope. The keynote of the great problem of Old Testament criticism—the Pentateuch—was struck as early as 1753 by Jean Astruc, a Frenchman; but the greatest impulse was given by De Wette. Dr. Arnold's desire for some one to do for Judea "what Wolf and Niebuhr had done for Greece and Rome" was in great measure filled by the great work of Ewald, which still stands without a rival in the field which it covers.

Next followed New Testament criticism, and the study of the Canon started by De Wette and carried on by Bretschneider, Gieseler, Schleiermacher, and the great founder of the Tübingen school, Ferdinand Christian Baur, who, whatever may be thought of his conclusions, did more than any single writer to place the science of historical criticism and church history on a solid basis. The immediate effect, however, was to produce something very like a revolution in theology. It is significant that the appearance of Strauss's "Leben Jesu" in 1835, marking the critical period of modern German theology, was preceded by two years by the publication in England of the first of the famous "Tracts for the Times." Thus both the body and form of the religious life and the foundation and science of the Christian faith were assailed at the same time.

At first the new school swept all before it; but after a time the tide turned, the conservative scholars began to gain the advantage, and some of the most important positions of the once-triumphant school were overthrown on the basis of investigations just as bold and careful and less prejudiced. The general result has been a great change and shifting in the views of theological opponents and the means used to defend them. Many of the positions held by the Tübingen school are held now, at least in part, by their opponents.

The new movement is by no means merely temporary or local, but includes the whole field of theology. It is not novel, but is a part of the noblest traditions of Protestantism. That it has come forward so recently is due to the fact that only recently has it acquired its materials in revised texts, old documents, inscriptions, etc. The idea of studying an organism not merely in its members, but in its associations, especially those from which it has absorbed its best power and life, has only recently developed, even in science, and its application to the history of the early Church excites with many unfeigned dislike and opposition. This will yield, for theological prejudice and ecclesiastical tradition have nothing to do with strict scientific criticism, whose one purpose is to discover the meaning of the Bible and the Fathers, without reference to any other claims but those of truth. Unquestionably there have been blunders, but no more than in other branches of scientific research.

Looking at some of the chief results reached, the following are noticed: First, the position and character of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments have been much changed. The Bible stands out more clearly as a rich and beautiful picture of the past, in which there is everywhere present a divine purpose and presence such as are not absent from every man's own personal experience to-day, and is more a living book to day than at any time since the sixteenth century. Another result is the establishment of the new science, or department of theological study, called Biblical Theology, which aims to find the point of view of each different book and section of the Bible as distinct from that theology which prepares its system and then seeks authorization from the Scriptures. In connection with this, in the field of dogmatics the influence of the critical movement has been most pronounced and most effective. The various systems, from the Alexandrians of the third century to the Tractarians of the nineteenth, have passed before the eye of the historical critic, who has gathered from them whatever of valuable contribution they have, and has shown that no one generation can do the thinking for every other—that each must do its own.

As a conclusion, the writer claims that the critical spirit represents the higher intellectual attitude of Protestantism as opposed to the ecclesiasticism of Romanism, and will carry its life with it, because it is moving in the path of right reason and science.

IMMIGRATION: A SYMPOSIUM. *Methodist Review*, September-October, 1891.

Recognizing that the subject is somewhat unwelcome, yet realizing its importance, three prominent writers—Rev. Charles Parkhurst, D.D., of Boston, Mass., Rev. W. H. Wilder, D.D., of Bloomington, Ill., and Professor G. L. Curtiss, D.D., of Greencastle, Ind.—discuss in a terse, practical way the value of immigration, its evil, and

the duty of it.

With retention to claims the dice is un- as to the tion on the increases of the triumphant "Our Co the quali ernment, have be Agassiz, Schurz, marvellous tion of a tian land

Dr. W laying st foreign n eration, sanity an our idea the qual having l instead motive, the cou simulate the tool the cla manifes tongue a meet an eral in but not and fati can peo

Profe duty of points: greatly forty y feet rig cept th disrega ple. 3 but is foreign has it a land, t may c zens, t erty, classes rations hauch allegia er on sober, tiously condit arms. To m Roman not be public govern the ch Ameri 3. Th

the duty of the Church and the nation toward it.

With regard to its value, Dr. Parkhurst calls attention to the fact that this is a land of immigrants; claims that restriction is imperative, that race prejudice is unchristian, and declares himself an optimist as to the effects of immigration. He bases his position on three points: 1. Immigration very greatly increases the material wealth and productive power of the nation, instancing Mr. Carnegie's "Triumphant Democracy" and Rev. Dr. Josiah Strong's "Our Country" in proof. 2. Immigration develops the qualities which make for a free republican government, and instances are given of many who have been prominent in our history—Ericsson, Agassiz, Philip Schaff, William M. Taylor, Carl Schurz, Andrew Carnegie. 3. Immigration has a marvellous value in the moral uplift and evangelization of all peoples, especially where it is to a Christian land, and when it meets a Christian ideal.

Dr. Wilder discusses the evil of immigration, laying stress upon the enormous rate of increase of foreign population, bringing with it Sabbath desecration, social discontent, illiteracy, pauperism, insanity and crime, and ignorance and carelessness of our ideas or forms of government. He claims that the quality of immigration has greatly deteriorated, having become largely involuntary and mercenary instead of voluntary and prompted by an ethical motive, and that instead of spreading itself through the country in such way as to be more readily assimilated, it collects in the cities, where it becomes the tool of designing men. Another danger lies in the clannish and colonizing tendencies that are manifested when communities speaking another tongue and careless of the language of the country meet and fraternize with little regard for the general interests or welfare. The last mentioned but not the least evil in the matter is that blind and fatal optimism so characteristic of the American people.

Professor Curtiss, taking up the question of the duty of the nation and the Church, takes up four points: 1. The character of the immigration has greatly deteriorated from what it was thirty to forty years ago. 2. The Government has a perfect right to restrict immigration and refuse to accept those as residents and citizens who utterly disregard its authority or the interests of the people. 3. The Government not only has the right, but is in duty bound to regulate the conduct of foreigners resident within her borders. Especially has it a right to restrict their purchase of American land, their absorption of American capital, and may compel them, if they refuse to become citizens, to leave the country and give up their property. 4. The duty of the Church toward the four classes of immigrants: (1) the infidel, sceptic, and rationalist; (2) the careless, indifferent, and debauched; (3) the dupes of Romanism, who hold allegiance to a foreign religious-political (*vic*) power on the banks of the Tiber; (4) a few good, sober, intelligent, industrious foreigners conscientiously seeking a home where they can better their condition. These last are to be met with open arms. In general the duty of the Church is: 1. To make a united effort to break the power of Romanism over the immigrants, so that they will not be moved as by machinery to interfere in the public schools and in the various branches of the government. 2. To compel through every State the children of immigrants to an attendance upon American schools, and be educated as Americans. 3. The churches must unite in some system of

missionary work to foreign populations in America that will reach and touch them all with the spirit of Christ. 4. Sufficient church accommodation must be secured so that foreigners may have suitable places for attending divine worship. This discussion, it is believed, will lead to two good results: 1. More stringent laws regarding immigration, alienation, and naturalization. 2. More careful and prayerful consideration of the duty of the churches to the immigrants.

GENERAL SUMMARY OF LEADING ARTICLES.

The Andover Review, Sept., 1891.

"Criticism *versus* Ecclesiasticism." See above.

"The Challenge of Life," by Rev. Chauncey B. Brewster, of Brooklyn, N. Y., is a discussion of the milder form of pessimism, especially as set forth by Edouard von Hartmann, whom the writer calls the Elisha of the pessimistic philosophy, as Schopenhauer might be considered its Elijah. After setting forth Hartmann's idea that the ultimate end of the world-process is happiness, which, however, can only be realized through painlessness, which must involve annihilation, some of the current answers of optimism, moderate meliorism, and utilitarianism or hedonism are considered and disposed of, and the conclusion is reached that the challenge involved in Hartmann's question, "What, then, to do with this life; with what substance of inner worth is it to be filled?" can only be answered by faith in the God of our life, a God of right and duty.

The article is valuable as setting forth in somewhat popular form ideas that are generally but vaguely understood.

"Apollonius of Rhodes and the Argonautica," by Professor Charles J. Goodwin, is a literary-historical study of one of the best of the Alexandrian poets, who lived in the third century after Christ, and who have been little known or studied.

"Some Experiments Worth Trying in the Ministry," by Rev. Charles M. Sheldon, of Topeka, Kan. In this short and interesting article Mr. Sheldon gives some of the results of his efforts to keep up such "variety and freshness in the work of his profession" as will "clothe old things with a new garment." Special stress is laid upon the absolute necessity for every man and every minister of self-development, especially in view of the constant drain on sympathy, intellect, spiritual forces, time, and physical energy. One solution is found in mapping out the year's work in a sort of Outlook, covering the Church-membership, Sunday-school, Week-day Service, Sermon, Parish Visiting, etc., and giving to each special attention for some one section—perhaps one month of the year. Objections and advantages are clearly given. Another experiment tried with success is to secure the assistance of the congregation in gathering materials for sermons, utilizing whatever specialists may be found on different topics. Again an effort has been made to find out accurately the standpoint of other men, particularly as it is affected by their occupations or surroundings—be for the time being, so far as is practicable, a clerk, carpenter, etc. The writer quotes George Macdonald's remark, "To try too hard to make people good is one way to make them worse," etc., and emphasizes his belief that methods and experiments are but means to an end, and that the secret of success lies in the truth that the new creature in Christ Jesus is the whole man expanded in all possible ways, and winning other men to the same life which the Master said He came to

bring to the world "more abundantly." A good, suggestive, practical article.

"A New Chain," by Rev. M. McG. Dana, D.D., of Lowell, Mass., is a plea for the better study of the problems of social science, especially in its relation to the Gospel of Christ. Courses of lectures on the subject, as given in the theological seminaries, do not furnish the opportunity for that careful study which every minister should give to the ethical problems he must meet in his daily ministrations. "The social problem is the field on which the decisive battle of Christianity must be fought," and the ministry should be armed to meet the conflict.

The whole number, including the editorial notes on a Benefit of the Higher Criticism, Recent Speculation in Canada, the International Congregational Council, James Russell Lowell, and the General View of India Missions, is exceptionally interesting and valuable.

The Methodist Review, Sept., Oct., 1891.

"The Gospel According to Mark," by Rev. F. W. Bristol, D.D., of Chicago, Ill., is a critical study of the Gospel, giving some of the results of the latest investigations.

"Immanuel—Prediction, Content, Fulfilment," by Professor W. W. Martin, of Vanderbilt University, is a study of Isaiah vii, 14, 15, especially in connection with an article by Professor H. G. Mitchell, of Boston, in the *Andover Review* for April, and taking the ground that Matthew, in quoting the verses, was unquestionably right in saying that they referred to Christ.

"Immigration: A Symposium," is more fully treated above.

"A Psychological Principle in Revelation," by Rev. J. W. E. Bowen, D.D., of Washington, D. C., takes the position that, as history is essentially a psychological science, the study of the historic manifestation and apprehension of religion is essentially a psychological study of the race. Thus the apprehension of religion is a process of growth depending upon the psychological growth of man; and thus we see that retrogression has alternated with progression just as in civilization and in science men have not always advanced by a direct route.

"The Kingdom of God," by Rev. B. F. Crary, D.D., of San Francisco, discusses the relation of the term to modern ideas; speaks of it as primarily a spiritual kingdom, but also as having an outer visible government. After considering some of its various aspects, the claims of different denominations to a special relation to it are briefly discussed, a very modest though earnest claim being made for Methodism.

"Regeneration," by Rev. James Douglas, D.D., of Pulaski, N. Y., is a distinctively theological article on the mechanical and vital theories of regeneration.

The Unitarian Review, Sept., 1891.

"The Peace of the Church," by William Everett, is a review of the "Bohlen Lectures," delivered in Philadelphia by Rev. W. R. Huntington, D.D., rector of Grace Church, N. Y. Those lectures were in defence of the propositions made in Chicago in 1886 and ratified at Lambeth in 1888 for a general union of all denominations on the basis of the Scriptures, the Apostles' Creed, the two Sacraments, and the Historic Episcopate. While recognizing to the full Dr. Huntington's ability and sincerity, the position is taken that his aim is imprac-

ticable, and that he shows marked ignorance of the other branches of the Church.

"Notes on Buddhism at Home," by George R. Mathews, is not so much an exposition of the religion as a series of suggestions or hints as to its relations to the life of the people, gathered from a considerable reading of the best books on the subject.

"Anti-Slavery: A Reminiscence," by the editor, Joseph Henry Allen, is another contribution of the kind furnished by Rev. Dr. A. P. Peabody in the *Andover Review* of August. Chatty and pleasant.

"The Higher Individualism," by Nicholas P. Gilman, is a plea for the putting forth of individual efforts to meet the social difficulties of the day. He claims that thus individual efforts would accomplish more than the general socialistic movement to relieve distress, and would be far more helpful in developing that higher grade of personal character without which general legislation will amount to nothing, since no advance is permanent which is not based on reformed individuals. The idea of State or governmental ownership or supervision is dependent for its efficacy largely upon attendant circumstances. What will do in one country will be of no avail in another. The relations of employer and employé are much the same anywhere, and are dependent upon the development of the higher character in each.

"A Reconstruction of the Apostolic Age" is an effort to weave the results of the historical criticism started by Baur into a brief connected statement.

The New Englander and Yale Review for September has two interesting literary articles on "English Lexicography," by Professor T. W. Hunt, of Princeton, and "A Study of Browning's Dramas," by Miss I. M. Street, of Ann Arbor, Mich.; a medical article on "Dying," by Dr. E. P. Buffet, taking the position that "what is significantly the agony of death may be presumed to be purely automatic, and therefore unfelt;" "The Genesis of Spatial Sensation," by E. Victor Bigelow, is a discussion of the causes of sensation. "German Socialism" is a translation of an article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, dealing with both the economic and political doctrines.

The Homiletic Review, Sept., 1891.

"The Pentateuchal Discussion—Present Outlook," by Professor E. C. Bissell, states the two opposing theories, and discusses certain points brought out more recently by those who claim the development theory. 1. They either quietly ignore or openly flout supernaturalism in the Bible and a revealed religion, notwithstanding that they find difficulty in fitting their theory to accepted facts. 2. The complexity of the theory and the obscure and intricate processes by which it is supported are becoming more and more apparent. 3. Its past history shows no real growth. 4. The present disagreements between its advocates makes them unsafe guides. 5. Effects of the analysis proposed are destructive in the extreme in the matter analyzed and the rest of the Bible. 6. Its chief supports fail under adequate tests.

"The Homiletical Value of Church History," by Rev. R. C. Hallock, Ph.D., claims that church history is: 1. A legitimate source of sermon material, as instanced by its use in the Bible; 2. Has great treasures (1) in illustrative material; (2) as an instrument of doctrinal instruction; (3) in eloquent themes; (4) in means of Church loyalty; (5) in its profit to the preacher himself.

"The Rel
Rev. W. H.
the true rel
two, warning
natural dicta

"On Wit
Saloon Unit
E. E. Hale,
without rais
of a single g
against an
has little ho

Herrick J
tionists are
on such a ba
that all shal
subordinate
Scriptur
D.D., is the
ples that sh

The Missio

"The Co
article by I
conception
missionary
one word t
prise. Es
sionary ch
home and
terprises at
do the exp
their fields
and instr
cation and
missionary
transporta
literature
on mission

"The F
A. J. Gor
calm, dign
sustains t
needed me
Holy Spiri
much cou
that Chri
Bishop:
we may
stances u
timely an

"Missi
Chaunce
answers t
history o
Prayer U

"Moh
Henry I
subject
pects qu
or Afric

"The
work of
by A. W

The
Rev. Dr
of inter
The M
Arabia,
Church

The
ber fur
"Relig

"The Religious Paper and the Ministry," by Rev. W. H. Ward, D.D., is a general discussion of the true relation that should obtain between the two, warning the minister against the general and natural dictation of the religious paper.

"On What Line may all the Enemies of the Saloon Unitedly do Battle?" is a symposium. E. E. Hale, D.D., takes the position that if all, without raising the question of the right or wrong of a single glass of wine, would unite in this fight against an open bar, they would succeed; but he has little hope that they will do so.

Herrick Johnson, D.D., claims that the prohibitionists are willing—at least the majority—to unite on such a basis, provided that be the one main thing that all shall unite in striving for, letting all else be subordinate.

"Scripture Interpretation," by James Mudge, D.D., is the first part of a discussion of the principles that should rule in that study.

The Missionary Review of the World, Sept., 1891.

"The Coming Age of Missions" is an editorial article by Rev. Dr. A. T. Pierson, setting forth his conception of the needs and characteristics of the missionary enterprise of the next century. The one word that is to characterize the work is ENTERPRISE. Each church is to be a distinctively missionary church with a double pastorate—one at home and the other abroad. Among suggested enterprises are: a great society for regions beyond, to do the exploring and arranging for the churches of their fields of work; a pioneer bureau for the aid and instruction of new missionaries; a great education and sustentation scheme for the training of missionary candidates on the field; a missionary transportation society; a great society for Christian literature; godly women representing the Church on mission boards, etc.

"The Faith Element in Missions," by Rev. Dr. A. J. Gordon, is an excellent article, considering in a calm, dignified, practical way the relations that faith sustains to the work of missions in securing the needed men, who must be pre-eminently men of the Holy Spirit; the needed money, without taking so much counsel of "business methods" as to forget that Christ is Chief Treasurer as well as Chief Bishop; the needed methods, not forgetting that we may expect miraculous help. Numerous instances under each head are cited. The article is timely and suggestive.

"Missions the True Prayer-Gauge," by Rev. Chauncey T. Edwards, Coudersport, Pa., discusses answers to prayer, especially as exemplified in the history of missions, and followed by a plea for a Prayer Union, by J. Sadler, of London.

"Mohammed and Mohammedanism," by Rev. Henry Rice, of Madras, India, is a study of that subject from the India standpoint, in some respects quite different from that of Arabia, Turkey, or Africa.

"The White Fields" is a sketch of the foreign work of the Foreign Sunday-School Association, by A. Woodruff, Esq., its president.

"The International Department, conducted by Rev. Dr. J. T. Gracey, is chatty, covering a number of interesting topics.

"The Monthly Concert of Missions covers Persia, Arabia, Turkey, Mohammedanism, and the Greek Church.

The Old and New Testament Student for September furnishes some suggestive articles, especially "Religious Instruction in the Public Schools of

Scotland and England," by James B. Reynolds, B.D.; "A Study of New Testament Precedent," by Rev. A. S. Carman, taking up the temporal, local, ethnic, personal, and spiritual limitations, and "The Study in the Gospel of John," by W. S. Harper and G. S. Goodspeed.

The general character of the articles, however, is suggestive of work to be done by somebody else rather than satisfactory by its own completeness.

The Expositor, London, Sept., 1891.

"Dr. H. H. Wendt, on the Fourth Gospel," by Rev. James Iverach, D.D., is a discussion of the position taken by Dr. Wendt that the source of the Gospel of John was a genuine writing of the apostle, similar in kind to the *Logia* of Matthew, but covering only the last portion of his life. The position itself and its attendant points in regard to the relation to the original of the additions made by followers are examined carefully, and the conclusions drawn that they are untenable.

"The Christology of the Earlier Chapters of the Acts of the Apostles," by Rev. W. Lock, M.A., is a study of the period succeeding the death of Christ, with regard to which we have no documents of certain date, and for which the writer of the Acts seems to have relied upon reports.

"The Resurrection of the Dead," by Rev. Professor W. Milligan, D.D., "The Aramaic Gospel—the Galilean Dialect," by Rev. Professor J. T. Marshall, M.A., are studies, the first exegetical, on 1 Cor. xv. 53-58, and the second linguistic, on the differences in the Synoptic Gospels.

"The Human Splendors—Our Lord's Third Temptation," by Rev. W. W. Peyton, is an effort to set forth the different ideas of splendor current at that time among the different races and nations, notably Greek and Roman, as they would appear to Christ.

The Newberry House Magazine, London, Sept., 1891.

"The Symbolism of the Few Living Creatures," by Rev. G. A. Cobbold, M.A., is a discussion of the relations of the vision in Ezekiel to the Four Gospels, and a study as to which creature represents which gospel.

"Church Progress in America," by Thomas B. Preston, is a historical sketch of the Episcopal denomination in America, dealing in this number especially with the period before the Revolutionary War.

"The Crosier and the Crown," by Rev. Canon Pennington, is a historical sketch of the struggle between the temporal and spiritual powers in the eleventh century.

"An Unclassified Class," by Eleanor Holmes, is an appeal for something to be done for the great number of women, especially married women, who do not come under any one of the classes usually helped by societies, and who yet need greatly some assistance, counsel, encouragement; also for those who have lost their virtue, but are not yet by any means irredeemably vicious. The fact that these are so unclassified makes it all the more essential to treat them as individuals. An excellent, timely article.

"Are High Churchmen Disloyal?" by H. Ormonde, gives a number of quotations from noted churchmen, showing that they looked upon the eucharist not only as a sacrament but as a sacrifice, and thus showing that those who now claim this position are not disloyal to the traditions of the Church.

CONTENTS OF RELIGIOUS PERIODICALS.

THE NEWBERRY HOUSE MAGAZINE.

London, September, 1891.

- The Symbolism of the Four Living Creatures. Rev. G. A. CEBOLD, M.A.
The More Excellent Way. Rev. JULIAN HARVEY, M.A.
Church Progress in America. I. THOS. B. PRESTON.
The Crosier and the Crown. Rev. CANON PENNINGTON.
Jacqueline Pascal. F. BAYFORD HARRISON.
An Unclassified Class. ELEANOR HOLMES.

Are High Churchmen Disloyal?
I. What our Great Divines Say.
II. The Eucharistic Sacrifice.

H. ORMONDE.

Eminent Churchmen—Rev. T. M. Neale.
Rev. GEO. HUNTINGTON, M.A.

THE YOUNG MAN.

London, September, 1891.

- A Lucky Hit. EDWARD GARRETT.
The End of the Holidays. W. J. DAWSON.
On the Learning of Languages. Prof. J. STUART BLACKIE.
The Hygiene of Breathing. A PHYSICIAN.
The Religious Uses of Hardship. Rev. JOSEPH PARKER, D.D.

THE EXPOSITOR.

London, September, 1891.

- Dr. H. H. Wendt on the Fourth Gospel. Rev. Prof. JAMES IVERACH, D.D.
The Christology of the Earlier Chapters of the Acts of the Apostles. Rev. W. LOCK, M.A.
The Resurrection of the Dead. Rev. Prof. W. MILLIGAN, D.D.
The Aramaic Gospel. The Galilean Dialect. Rev. Prof. J. T. MARSHALL, M.A.
The Human Splendors. Our Lord's Third Temptation. Rev. W. W. PEYTON.

THE MISSIONARY REVIEW OF THE WORLD.

New York, October, 1891.

- The Coming Age of Missions. ARTHUR T. PIERSON, D.D.
The Faith Element in Missions. A. J. GORDON, D.D.
Missions the True Prayer League. Rev. CHAUNCEY T. EDWARDS.
Mohammed and Mohammedanism. Rev. HENRY RICE.
The American Protestant Orphanage of Broosa. M. BAGHDASARIAN.
The White Fields. A. WOODRUFF.
Shemmas Meekha of Mosul. Rev. T. LAURIE.
The Brave Mountain Girl. Rev. JOHN C. MECHLIN.
Hassan Botan. Rev. F. G. COAN.

NEW ENGLANDER AND YALE REVIEW.

New Haven, September, 1891.

- English Lexicography. Prof. T. W. HUNT, Princeton, N. J.

A Study of Browning's Poems.

Miss I. M. STREET, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Eathanasia: The Pleasures of Dying.

E. P. BUFFET, M.D., Jersey City, N. J.

Genesis of Spatial Sensation.

E. VICTOR BIGELOW, Cambridge, Mass.

German Socialism.

J. BOURDEAU, in *Revue des Deux Mondes*. Translated by J. C. SCHWEB, Yale University.

THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT STUDENT.

Hartford, Conn., September, 1891.

- The Modern Jew and his Synagogue. Rev. Prof. T. W. DAVIES, B.D.
Relation of the New Testament to the Mosaic System. Rev. F. W. C. MEYER.
A Classification of the Solomonian Proverbs. KICHIRO TONASA, Ph.D.
Religious Instruction in the Public Schools of Scotland and England. JAMES B. REYNOLDS, B.D.
A Study of New Testament Precedent. II. Rev. A. S. CARMAN.
The Gospel of John. W. E. HARPER and GEORGE S. GOODSPEED.
General Features of Semitic Religions. Prof. MORRIS JASTROW, Jr.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Edinburgh, September, 1891.

- Notes of Recent Exposition, Klostermann versus Kautzsch and Socin. The Great Text Commentary, etc., and Articles by Rev. Prof. H. E. RYLE, Cambridge; WADDY MOSS, Manchester; H. GRAETZ, D.D., Breslau; GEORGE G. FINDLAY, B.A., and W. T. LYNN, B.A., F.R.A.S.

METHODIST REVIEW (Bi-Monthly).

New York and Cincinnati, September, October, 1891.

- The Gospel According to Mark. Rev. L. M. BRISTOL, D.D., Chicago, Ill.
Immanuel—Prediction, Content, Fulfillment. Prof. W. W. MARTIN, M.A., Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
Immigration: A Symposium. Rev. CHARLES PARKHURST, D.D., Boston, Mass.; Rev. W. H. WILDER, D.D., Bloomington, Ill.; Prof. G. L. CURTIS, D.D., Greencastle, Ind.
A Psychological Principle in Revelation. Rev. J. W. E. BOWEN, D.D., Washington, D.C.
The Kingdom of God. Rev. B. F. CRARY, D.D., San Francisco, Cal.
Regeneration. Rev. JAMES DOUGLAS, D.D., Pultaski, N. Y.
The Story of the Resurrection of the Christ. Rev. WILLIAM JONES, D.D., Sedalia, Mo.

THE ANDOVER REVIEW.

Boston, September, 1891.

- Criticism versus Ecclesiasticism. I. Criticism. Rev. STEWART MEANS.
The Challenge of Life. Rev. CHAUNCEY B. BREWSTER.
Apollonias of Rhodes and the Argonautica. Prof. CHAS. S. J. GOODWIN.
Some Experiments Worth Trying in the Ministry. Rev. CHARLES M. SHELDOX.
A New Chair. MALCOLM MCG. DANA, D.D.

THE UNITARIAN REVIEW.

Boston, September, 1891.

- "The Peace of the Church." A Review. WILLIAM EVERETT.
Notes on Buddhism at Home. GEORGE R. MATTHEWS.
Anti-Slavery: A Reminiscence. JOSEPH HENRY ALLEN.
The Higher Individualism. NICHOLAS P. GILMAN.
Critical Theology: A Reconstruction of the Apostolic Age.
Unitarianism in Ireland.

OUR DAY.

Boston, September, 1891.

- The Anti-Opium Resolution in Parliament. EX-PRES. CYRUS HAMLEN.
Vampire Literature. ANTHONY COMSTOCK.
Present Tendencies of American Congregationalism. Prof. L. F. STEARNS.
The Pan-Congregational Council in London. Rev. Dr. JOSEPH PARKER.
Boston Hymn—Warp and Woof. JOSEPH COOK.
Boston Monday Lecture, 16th Year. General Booth's Great Plan for the Poor. Invited and Uninvited Poverty. JOSEPH COOK.

THE THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

London, September, 1891.

- Exegetical Hints on the Old Testament. CANON FAUSSET, D.D.
Philosophy and Religion. Part III. EDWARD NAVILLE.
The Original Rechabites. ERNEST BOWDEN.
The Secret of the Epistle to the Hebrews. A. H. WHITFIELD.
Inspired Hebrew Poetry. Part I. J. NEILL.

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

New York, October, 1891.

- Clerical Conservatism and Scientific Radicalism. Principal W. CAVEN, D.D.
The Higher Criticism and the Tombs of Egypt. Egyptology No. VIII. Rev. CANDLER M. COLEMAN, Ph.D.
Richard Rolle, the Hampole Hermit. Prof. T. W. HUNT, Ph.D., L.H.D.
Popular Misapprehensions of the Roman Catholic Doctrine, Polity, and Usage. Rev. C. C. STARBUCK.

CONTENTS

HARPER'S MA
Frontispiece—
tration to "Cal
Fenimore Woo
graphs, and fro
and others—the
male—mosques
domestic archite
Will be Done"
Dickens to W
Hutton—famili
Legend of Son
"The Art Stud
Van Dyke, the
school—the or
pose and meth
Ibbetson" (a
fourteen illus
ted" (a poem)
by Richard H
lecture (St.
Schuyler—wor
istic features
buildings—chi
dwellings in
architecture?
illustrations
ent's adventur
"An Imperat
Howells—the
"Common-se
popular paper
gery;" "Lon
Besant, with
D. Nichols—
craftsmen—
of the comm
severity of th
a Painter's W
Editor's E
of Cynicus—
under a Col
Dean Howel
Japan;" "P
Warner; M
1891.)

THE CEN
Rudyard K
George Ke
"Aerial Na
"Besieged
ner;" "On
the;" "A W
Robins Pe
Perry;" "T
"An Escap
Richard E
Chaplain,
Matthews
"Who wa
Robber."
di Credi,
Edmund
ing in Nic
Baldwin,
olay;" "A
Doctor;"
Century"
spect;"
linal Refo
"Laurele
MacLay;"
"What t
Paradox.
Horton
sladen.

SCRIB
Mountai
drawn L
Rome,"
the Gre
engravin
J. Clém
"The V
son an
William
Hunt
illustra
man in
of Wo
to One
in the
ical Su
L. Wi
Broug

CONTENTS OF OCTOBER MAGAZINES.

HARPER'S MAGAZINE for October has these contents: Frontispiece—"Street in the New Quarter of Cairo"—illustration to "Cairo in 1800," "Cairo in 1890," by Constance Fenimore Woolson, numerous illustrations after photographs, and from drawings by W. T. Snedley, W. M. Chase, and others—the peculiar attractiveness of Cairo—the climate—mosques—the Gizeh Museum—the bazaars—the Nile—domestic architecture—the pyramids—the Copts—Kief: "Thy Will be Done" (a poem), by John Hay; "Letters of Charles Dickens to Wilkie Collins," Part II., edited by Laurence Hutton—familiar correspondence from 1856 to 1861; "A Legend of Sonora," (a story), by Hildegard Hawthorne; "The Art Students' League of New York," by Dr. John C. Van Dyke, with nine illustrations drawn by pupils of the school—the origin of the League—its history—its purpose and methods—native art—art students abroad; "Peter Ibbetson" (a novel), Part V., by George du Maurier, with fourteen illustrations drawn by the author; "Interpreted" (a poem), by Angelina W. Way; "A Unfinished Story," by Richard Harding Davis; "Glimpses of Western Architecture (St. Paul and Minneapolis), Ill., by Montgomery Schuyler—wonderful growth of the twin cities—characteristic features of their architecture—some remarkable public buildings—church architecture—residential St. Paul—dwellings in Minneapolis—is there such a thing as Western architecture? "A Courier's Ride," by F. D. Millet, with ten illustrations; "The author—narrative of a war correspondent's adventure in Bulgaria in the Russo-Turkish war of 1877; "An Imperative Duty" (a novel), Part IV., by William Dean Howells—the conclusion of Mr. Howells's remarkable story; "Common-sense in Surgery," by Helen H. Gardener, a brief popular paper on some of the recent triumphs of practical surgery; "London—Plantagenet," III.,—the people, by Walter Besant, with ten illustrations drawn by Harry Fenn and H. B. Nichols—foreigners in medieval London—who were the craftsmen?—a city of tradesmen—the sports and amusements of the common people—saints' days—festivals—processions—severity of the laws—external splendor of the city; "Trials of a Painter's Wife," full-page illustration by George du Maurier; "Editor's Easy Chair," by George William Curtis—the sneer of Cynicus—the press at sea—morality and the playhouse—under a Colonial roof-tree; "Editor's Study," by William Dean Howells—two rather puzzling books—recent books on Japan; "Editor's Drawer," conducted by Charles Dudley Warner; Monthly Record of Current Events (to August 12, 1891).

THE CENTURY for October has these contents: "Portrait of Rudyard Kipling," frontispiece; "My Last Days in Siberia," George Kennan; "Was it an Exceptional Case?" Matt Cull; "Aerial Navigation"—the Power Required, Hiram S. Maxim; "Besieged by the Utes"—the Massacre of 1879, Col. E. V. Sumner; "On a Blank Leaf in 'The Marble Faun,'" Elia W. Peattie; "A Water Tournament" (play in Provençe), Elizabeth Robins Pennell; "In Answer to a Question," Lilla Cabot Perry; "The Press and Public Men," Gen. H. V. Boynton; "An Escapade in Cordova," F. Hopkinson Smith; "Masks," Richard E. Burton; "Pro Patria"—In Memory of a Faithful Chaplain, R. W. Gilder; "The Story of a Story," Brander Matthews; "The Wood-Maid," Helen Thayer Hutcheson; "Who was El Dorado?" Lieut. Henry Rowan Lemly; "The Robber," James B. Kenyon; "Italian Old Masters"—Lorenzo di Credi, Pergino, W. J. Stillman; "Rudyard Kipling," Edmund Gosse; "Love," William Wilfred Campbell; "Tarrying in Nicaragua"—to California in 1849, letters of Roger S. Baldwin, Jr.; "Lincoln's Personal Appearance," J. G. Nicolay; "A Summer Pool," Charles G. D. Roberts; "The Faith Doctor" (Conclusion), Edward Eggleston; "Lowell," "The Century" a National Magazine; "A Cheap-Money Retrospect," "Presidential Voting Methods," "The Key to Municipal Reform," James Russell Lowell, Poet and Citizen; "Laurels of the American Tar in 1812," H. Y. Powell, E. S. MacLay; "A Reply to Certain Criticisms," George Kennan; "What my Clock Says," Nelly Marshall McAfee; "The Poet Paradox," John Kendrick Bange; "Deserving Poor," George Horton; "To the River St. Lawrence in Autumn," Douglas Sladen.

SCRIBNER'S for October has these contents: "Bear in the Mountains"—frontispiece, "Hunting American Big Game," drawn by A. B. Frost, engraving by Andrew; "The Corso of Rome," by W. W. Story (the fourth article of the series on the Great Streets of the World), illustrations by Ettore Tito, engraving by Peckwell, Aikman, Miss Powell, Leblanc, and J. Clément; "The Voices of Earth," by Archibald Lampman; "The Wrecker"—Chapters VII.-IX., by Robert Louis Stevenson and Lloyd Osbourne, with a full-page illustration by William Holman Hunt; "Autumn Haze," by R. K. Monkman; "Hunting American Big Game," by Archibald Rogers, illustrations by A. B. Frost; "C. H. R.—Lost off Halmun in the China Sea," by Julia C. R. Dorr; "The Actions of Wounded Animals," by J. N. Hall, M.D.; "In One's Age to One's Youth," by Edith M. Thomas; "The New Lake in the Desert," by J. W. Powell, Director of the U. S. Geological Survey; "The Biography of the Oyster," by Edward L. Wilson, illustrations by Carlton T. Chapman, Charles Broughton and J. H. Twachtman, engraving by Aikman,

C. I. Butler, Merrill, and Heard; "Clytie," by Ernst Schottky, with headband and initial by Kenyon Cox; "A Prayer," by Anne Reeve Aldrich; "Carlyle's Politics," by Edwin C. Martin; "Captain Black," by Charles E. Carryl; "The Point of View"—Imagination and Livelihood—The Caviare Theatre—Laurence Oliphant's Life—Sancta Simplicitas.

LITTINGOTT'S MAGAZINE for October has these contents: "Lady Patty," by The Duchess; "Healthy Heroines," by Julien Gordon; "A Tiffin with a Taotal," by Edward Bedloe; "October," by Florence Earle Coates; "The Bells of San Gabriel," by Gertrude Franklin Atherton; "A Minor Chord," by Ella Wheeler Wilcox; "Dream and Deed," by Katharine Lee Bates; "The Common Roads of Europe," by John Glimmer Speed; "Sea-Bird of the Broken Wing," by Roden Noel; "Sonnet" (upon Courbet's Picture "The Wave"), by R. T. W. Duke, Jr.; "With Washington and Wayne," by Melville Phillips; "The Lost Landfall of Columbus," by William Agnew Paton; "Divided," by Helen Grace Smith; "Humanitarian Hours," by Lilian North; "Rhymes of Childhood," by R. M. Johnston; "With the Wife" (illustrated by leading Artists).

LITTELL'S LIVING AGE. The numbers of *The Living Age* for September 12th and 19th contain "The Revival of Quakerism," *Edinburgh*; "Port-Royal," *London Quarterly*; "The 'Apology' of Aristides," *Contemporary*; "The Poet of the Klephts," *Nineteenth Century*; "The Persecuted Russian Jews," *Nationalist*; "The Anak of Publishers" and "The Congress of Vienna," *Temple Bar*; "St. Jean de Luz" and "Some Pagan Epitaphs," *Cornhill*; "Scarron" and "Ignatius Loyola," *Belgravia*; "The Strange Instincts of Cattle," *Longman's*; "The Death of Mr. Lowell," *Times and Speaker*; with instalments of "Montes the Matador," "Francesca's Revenge" and "Jeanne Zephir's Lovers," and poetry.

THE ATLANTIC MONTHLY for October, 1891, has these contents: "The House of Martha," XLVIII.-LI., Frank R. Stockton; "Emily Dickinson's Letters," Thomas Wentworth Higginson; "The Hawkbit," Charles G. D. Roberts; "Granther Hill's Patridge," Rowland E. Robinson; "The Ascetic Ideal," Harriet Waters Preston and Louise Dodge; "Deep-Sea Springs," Edith M. Thomas; "In London with Doctor Swift," Henry F. Randolph; "The Lady of Fort St. John," XIII.-XV., Mary Hartwell Catherwood; "General George H. Thomas," Henry Stone; "The Cave-Dwellers of the Confederacy," David Dodge; "The Equinoctial on the Ipswich Dunes," Frank Bolles; "The Bubble," John B. Tabb; "The Late Sir John Macdonald," Martin J. Griffin; "A People without Law," I., James Bradley Thayer; "James Russell Lowell, 1819-1891," Oliver Wendell Holmes; "Ignatius von Dollinger," E. P. Evans; "Mr. Howells's Literary Creed," "Comment on New Books," "The Contributors' Club," "Mr. Lowell and the Atlantic."

MONTHLY BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS LITERATURE.

[Any of these books may be ordered through the Christian Literature Co.]

Andrews, W. Old Church Lore. Hull: Andrews, 1891. Pp. 257, 8vo, 6s.

Aurès, Auguste. Traité de métrologie Assyrienne, ou Étude de la numération et du système métrique assyrien considérés dans leurs rapports, dans leurs rapports, et dans leur ensemble. Paris: Rouillon, 1891. Pp. 106, 8vo, 6 fr.

Barrou, L. La Raison et la foi. 8e fascicule. Paris: Sauvaire, 1891. 8vo, 4 fr.

Bascom, John. The New Theology. New York: Putnam, 1891. Pp. viii., 217, 8vo, \$1.50.

Beck, J. T. Erklärung des Briefes Pauli an die Epheser, nebst Anmerkungen zum Briefe Pauli an die Kolosser. Herausgegeben von Julius Lindenmeyer. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1891. Pp. xii., 271, 8vo, 3.60 mk.

Bender, August, Pfarrer. Vorträge über die Offenbarung Gottes auf alttestamentlichem Boden mit steter Berücksichtigung der kritischen Forschung. Gütersloh: 1891. Pp. viii., 256, 8vo, 3 mk.

Bible, La. Traduction nouvelle d'après les textes hébreux et grecs par E. Ledrain. Tom 7. Œuvres morales et Syriques. I.: Cantic des Cantiques, Ecclésiaste, Proverbes, Sapience, Ecclésiastique, Ruth, Esther, Tobie, Judith. Paris: Lemerre, 1891. Pp. iv., 503, 8vo, 7.50 fr.

Bliss, Edwin Munsell, Rev. (ed.). Encyclopædia of Missions. A thesaurus of facts, historical, statistical, geographical, ethnological, and biographical; with maps, bibliography, and statistical tables. New York: Funk, 1891. 2 vols. Pp. 1340, 8vo, cloth, \$12.00.

Bocock, John H., D.D. Selections from the Religious and Literary Writings of —. With a biographical sketch by C. R. Vaughan, D.D. Edited by his widow. Richmond, Va.: Whittem, 1891. Pp. xxvii, 444, 8vo.

Böttger, H. Das Urchristenthum, aus dem Heiden- und Judenthum durch Christi, des ersten Meßias, Lehre, Leben, Wirken, Sterben, und Auferstehen entwickelt und begründet. Aus den Urquellen, wie nie zuvor, bewiesen. 2. Auflage. Breslau: Freund, 1891. Pp. xii, 163, 8vo, 3 mk.

Boudignon, J. B., Abbé. L'Encyclopédie sur la question sociale, avec commentaire historique et littéral. Paris: Lethellieux, 1891. Pp. 115, 8vo, 2 fr.

Bratke, E., Dr. Das Monogramm Christi auf dem Latharum Constantinus des Grossen. Jauer: Guericke, 1891. Pp. 13, 8vo, 1 mk.

Burghard, W. Die Gegenreformation auf dem Elbsfelde vom Jahre 1574-1579. II. Theil. Vom Regensburger Kurtag 1575 bis zum Jahre 1579. Leipzig: Fock, 1891. Pp. 58, 8vo, 30 pf.

Calvini, Joannis. In novum testamentum commentarii. Ex Calvini operum collectione Brunsvicensi separatim editi. Vol. I. Harmonia Evangeliorum. 2 partes. Braunschweig: Schwetschke, 1891. Pp. x, 1217, 8vo, 6 mk.

Cappelli, V. Sulla persona del Cefa redarguitosi dall'Apostolo Paolo in Antiochia; disquisizione polemica. Milano: Artigianelli, 1891. Pp. 77, 16mo.

Cheyne, Thomas Kelly, M.A., D.D. The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter in the Light of Old Testament Criticism and History of Religion. With an introduction and appendices. Eight lectures preached before the University of Oxford in the year 1889 on the Foundation of the late Rev. John Hampton, M.A. New York: Whittaker, 1891. Pp. xxxviii, 517, 8vo, \$4.00.

Claravallensis, J. Die falschmünzerische Theologie Albrecht Kitzschs und die christliche Wahrheit. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1891. Pp. 230, 8vo, 2,40 mk.

Codrington, R. H. Melanesians: Studies in their Anthropology and Folklore. Lond.: Ox. Warehouse, 1891. Pp. 436, 8vo, 16s.

Coerper, Fritz, Pfarrer. Die Auferweckung des Lazarus. Eine biblische Betrachtung. Elberfeld: Buchhandlung der Evang. Gesellschaft, 1891. Pp. 46, 8vo, 30 pf.

Corpus scripturarum ecclesiasticorum latinorum editum Consilio et impensis academiae litterarum caesareae viennensis. Vol. XXI. et Vol. XXV., pars I. Inhab. XXI. Fausti Rhenici praeter sermones pseudo-Eusebianos. opera. Accedunt Rurici epistulae. Recensuit, commentario critico instructis, prolegomenis et indices adjecit A. Engelbrecht. Pp. lxxx, 465, 16 mk. XXV. I. S. Aurelii Augustini operum sectionis VI. pars I. De utilitate credendi et de duabus animabus contra Fortunatum, contra Adimantum, contra epictetum fundamini, contra Faustum, ex recensione J. Zycha. Pp. 707, 20,40 mk. Wien: Tempsky, 1891. 8vo, 36,40 mk.

Dalman, Gustaf H. Jesaja 53, das Prophetenwort vom Sündknecht des Heilthums, mit besonderer Rücksicht der synagogalen Literatur erläutert. 2. Ausg. Berlin: Evangel. Vereins-Buchhandlung, 1891. Pp. iv, 53, 8vo, 1 mk.

Delitzsch, Franz, D.D. Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah. Authorized translation by the Rev. James Denney, B. D. In two volumes. (Foreign Biblical Library, edited by the Rev. W. Robertson Nicoll, M. A., LL.D.) Vol. I. New York: Funk, 1891. Pp. vii, 520, 8vo, \$2.50.

De Rossi, John Baptist. The Life of —. Translated from the Italian by Lady Herbert. Introduction on Ecclesiastical Training and the Sacerdotal Life by the Bishop of Salford. Baltimore: Murphy, 1891. Pp. x, 311, 8vo.

Doane, William Crowell, Rt. Rev. I. T. D., LL.D. Addresses to the Graduating Classes of St. Agnes School. New York: Whittaker, 1891. Pp. 238, 8vo, \$1.20.

Drane, A. T. The History of St. Dominic, Founder of the Friars Preachers. London: Longmans, 1891. 8vo, 15s.

Dreves, G. M. Analecta hymnica medii aevi. X. Sequentia iudicia. Liturgische Prosen des Mittelalters aus Handschriften und Wiegendrucken. 3. Folge. Leipzig: Reissland, 1891. Pp. 336, 8vo, 10 mk.

Egidy, M. von. Das einige Christenthum. (Erste Gedanken; Weiteres und Ausbau; Bericht über die Pfingst-Versammlung, in 1. Band.) Berlin: Bibliog. Bureau, 1891. Pp. 53, 14, 13, 15, 16, 16, 16, 16, 19, 36, 8vo, 2,70 mk.

Elbel, Benjamin, O.S.F. Theologia moralis per modum conferentiarum. Novis curis edidit Ireneus Bierbaum. Pars IV. (Vol. II.). Paderborn: Bonifacius Druckerel, 1891. Pp. v, 437-568, 8vo, 1,50 mk. (I.-VI. 12,15 mk.)

Fey, C. Urtheile Dr. M. Luthers über das Papstthum. Aus seinen Schriften zusammengetragen. Leipzig: Ev. Bund-Buchhandlung, 1891. Pp. iii, 50, 8vo, 50 pf.

Friedrich, J. (Machliss.) Die Unechtheit des Galaterbriefes. Ein Beitrag zu einer kritischen Geschichte des Urchristenthums. Halle a. S.: Krammerer, 1891. Pp. 67, 8vo, 1,20 mk.

Gailhard, G., Dr. Darwinisme et Spiritualisme. Paris: Perrin, 1891. 12mo, 3,50 fr.

Gevaert, Ang. Der Ursprung des römischen Kirchengesanges. Musikgeschichtliche Studie. Deutsch von Dr. Hugo Riemann. Leipzig: Breitkopf, 1891. Pp. 87, 8vo, 2,80 mk.

Gowen, H. Temperentia. Lond.: Skeffington, 1891. Pp. 79, cr. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Gratz, H. History of the Jews. Vol. I. From the earliest period to the death of Simon the Maccabee. Philadelphia: Jew. Pub. Soc. of Am., 1891. Pp. 538, 8vo, cloth, \$3.00.

Grüssel, Wolfgang. Justinianus von Weltz, der Vorkämpfer der lutherischen Mission. (Missionsbibliothek von W. Faber. Nr. 2 und 3.) Leipzig: Akad. Buchhandlung, 1891. Pp. iv, 191, 8vo, 2 mk.

Halévy, J. Recherches bibliques. 13e fascicule. Versailles: Cerf, 1891. Pp. 365-634, 8vo.

Hanna, William, D.D. Wars of the Huguenots. New Issue. New York: Treat, 1891. Pp. 314, 8vo, \$1.00.

Haskell, L., Mrs. The Sweet Story of Old. A Life of Christ for Children of all Ages. With an introduction by the Venerable Archdeacon Farrar, D.D. New York: Dutton, 1891. Pp. 64, 12mo, 50 cts.

Hatch, Edwin, D.D. Overcoming the World, and other Sermons, by the late —. With biographical notices by his brother. New York: Whittaker, 1891. Pp. xiii, 336, 8vo, \$1.50.

Henschel, A. Evangelische Lebenszeugen des Posener Landes aus alter und neuer Zeit. Posen: Decker, 1891. Pp. xxiv, 465, 8vo, 7,50 mk.

Historical Evidences of the Old Testament. New York: Am. Tr. Soc., 1891. Pp. 319, 12mo, \$1.00.

[CONTENTS: The Witness of Ancient Monuments to the Old Testament Scriptures, by A. H. Sayce; The Vitality of the Bible, by Rev. W. G. Blaikie; Present State of the Christian Argument from Prophecy, by Principal Cairns; The Origin of the Hebrew Religion, by Rev. Eustace K. Couder; The Bible Tested, or, Is it the Book for To-day and for the World? by Jacob Chamberlain; The Old Testament Vindicated, by the Rev. T. W. Chambers, D.D.]

Historical Evidences of the New Testament. New York: Am. Tr. Soc., 1891. Pp. 323, 12mo, \$1.00.

[CONTENTS: Historical Illustrations of the New Testament Scriptures, by Rev. G. F. Maclear; The Christ of the Gospels, a Religious Study, by Rev. Henry Meyer; Ferdinand Christian Baur and his Theory of the Origin of Christianity, and of the New Testament Writings, by Rev. A. B. Bruce; The Religious Value of the Doctrines of Christianity, by Prof. C. M. Des Isles; Unity of Faith a Proof of the Divine Origin and Preservation of Christianity, by the Rev. J. Stoughton; The Evidential Value of the Observance of the Lord's Day, by the Rev. G. F. Maclear.]

Kanponton, Isaac, Rabbi. Der "Gaon von Kastilien," David Hagmar. Die Methodologie des babylonischen Talmud. Mit einem Vorwort herausgegeben von J. H. Weiss. (In hebräischer Sprache.) Wien: Lippe, 1891. Pp. iii, 20, 8vo, 80 pf.

Karte des Nyassagebiets, Ost-Afrika, mit Angabe der vorhandenen Missions- und Handelsstationen und des Schutzes der geplanten Berliner und Brüder-Mission. Berlin: Berl. Evang. Missionsgesellschaft, 1891. 30 pf.

Kornumpf, Franz. Die Anfänge der evangelischen Mission in Deutsch Ost-Afrika. Berlin: Missionsgesellschaft, 1891. Pp. 29, 16mo, 10 pf.

Lagarde, Paul de. Mittheilungen. 4. Band. Göttingen: 1891. Pp. 432, 8vo, 12 mk.

Lasserre, Pierre. La crise chrétienne. Questions d'aujourd'hui. Paris: Perrin, 1891. 12mo, 3,50 fr.

Lightfoot, Joseph Barber, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D. Sermons Preached on Special Occasions. Published by the Trustees of the Lightfoot Fund. New York: Macmillan, 1891. Pp. xii, 380, 12mo, \$1.75.

Ludlow, James M. A King of Tyre. A tale of the times of Ezra and Nehemiah. New York: Harpers, 1891. Pp. 238, 12mo, \$1.00.

Macqu...
York: U.

Maggi...
testi greci.
morali.

Malat...
Paris: Sa...

Marte...
der diese
Homani, I.

Mathe...
essay on
cinatti.

Miller...
Crowell,

Morte...
(1160-1118)
seconde
8 fr.

Müth...
chen. C.
Böhme, I.

Muri...
Des Phil.
platonis
gestell.

Mur...
Gardine

Owe...
Savigny
viii. 39.

Phe...
beleucht
8vo, 4

Pier...
Tear a
Leroux

Por...
ult. c.
ciens

Por...
aus de
beacht
führt

Por...
2te A.
225 n.

Ra...
count
the M.

Ri...
und
Ludw.

Wi...
47, 8

R...
1891.

R...
The
Sp.

S...
gras
7,50

S...
Apo
Pra

S...
Ne

Ar...

M...
lan

h...
Po

L...
fr

Macquerey, Howard. Rev. Topics of the Times. New York: U. S. Bk. Co., 1891. Pp. 238, 12mo, \$1.00.

Maggi, Ces. La sacra infanzia di Gesù Cristo secondo i testi greci, tradotti in volgare, con note storiche ed esegetico-morali. Siena: Bernardino, 1890. Pp. xiv., 304, 16mo, 2 l.

Malato, Ch. Révolution chrétienne et Révolution sociale. Paris: Savine, 1891. 12mo, 3.50 fr.

Martens, W. War Gregor VII. Mönch? Beleuchtung der diese Frage bejahriger herrschaftliche Meinung. Danzig: Homan, 1891. Pp. 52, 8vo, 65 pf.

Mathews, Robert T. Evangelistic Sermons. With an essay on the Scriptural and Catholic Creed of Baptism. Cincinnati: Standard Pub. Co., 1891. Pp. 395, 8vo, \$1.50.

Miller, J. R. D. D. Making the Most of Life. New York: Crowell, 1891. Pp. vi., 275, 16mo, \$1.00.

Mortet, Victor. Maurice de Sully. Evêque de Paris (1160-1196). Étude sur l'administration épiscopale pendant la seconde moitié du XIIe siècle. Paris: Picard, 1891. 8vo, 8 fr.

Mühe, Ernst. Biblische Merkwürdigkeiten. 4 Bändchen. (Neue Lichtstrahlen in dunkle Bibelstellen.) Leipzig: Böhme, 1891. Pp. viii., 182, 8vo, 1.60 mk.

Murr, Joseph, Dr. Was sagt uns Platon vom Jenseits? Des Philosophen Lehre von den letzten Dingen, aus Citaten platonischer Schriften in deutscher Uebersetzung zusammengestellt. Innsbruck: Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1891. Pp. 31, 12mo, 48 pf.

Murray, J. C. An Introduction to Ethics. London: Gardner, 1891. Pp. 411, cr. 8vo, 6s. 6d.

Owen, J. W. The Common Salvation of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Notes of a study of Romans I. 17-viii. 33. London: Pathecock, 1891. Pp. 250, 8vo, 5s.

Pfeiderer, Otto. Die Ritsch'sche Theologie. Kritisch beleuchtet. Braunschweig: Swetschke, 1891. Pp. viii., 139, 8vo, 4 mk.

Pierling, Père. La Russie et l'Orient. Mariage d'un Tsar au Vatican. Ivan III. et Sophie Paléologue. Paris: Leroux, 1891. Pp. viii., 215, 18mo, 2.50 fr.

Pomerans, Bernard. La Grèce et la Judée dans l'antiquité. Coup d'œil sur la vie intellectuelle et morale des anciens Grecs et Hébreux. 1. partie. Wien: Lippe, 1891. Pp. 93, 8vo, 2.40 mk.

Posselt, Wilhelm. Der Kaffermisionär. Ein Lebensbild aus der afrikanischen Mission, von dem Missionar selbst beschrieben und nach seinen Jahresberichten ergänzt, fortgeführt und herausgegeben von E. Pfister und D. Wangemann. 2te Auflage. Berlin: Buchhandlung, 1891. Pp. 210, 8vo, 2.25 mk.

Randall, D. A., D.D. The Tabernacle in Sinai. An account of the structure, signification and spiritual lessons of the Mosaic tabernacle erected in the Wilderness of Sinai. Boston: Bradley & Woodruff, 1891. Pp. 420, 8vo, \$1.50.

Riemann, O. Dr. Was wissen wir über die Existenz und Unsterblichkeit der Seele? Eine Polemik gegen Dr. Ludwig Büchner's "Das künftige Leben und die moderne Wissenschaft." Magdeburg: Heinrichshofen, 1891. Pp. iv., 47, 8vo, 1 mk.

Robertson, C. G. Cesar Borgia. The Stanhope Essay for 1891. Oxford: Blackwell, 1891. Pp. 90, 8vo, 2s.

Robins, Henry E., D.D. The Harmony of Ethics with Theology. An essay in revision. New York: Armstrong, 1891. Pp. 100, 16mo, \$1.00.

Saalfeld, G. A. De biblorum sacrorum Vulgate editionis graecitate. Quedlinburg: Vieweg, 1891. Pp. xvi., 180, 8vo, 7.50 mk.

Sachse, H. Bernardus Guidonis Inquisitor und die Apostelbrüder. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Practica. Rostock: Leopold, 1891. Pp. 58, 8vo, 2 mk.

Sanborn, F. B. Dr. S. G. Howe, the Philanthropist. New York: Funk, 1891. Pp. xiii., 370, 8vo, \$1.50.

Sermon Bible. St. Luke I. to St. John III. New York: Armstrong, 1891. Pp. 414, 12mo, \$1.50.

Short Life of the Blessed Peter Aloysius Mary Chanel, Marist Priest and First Martyr of Oceania. Abberville: Pallart, 1891. Pp. 32, 18mo.

Smyth, J. P. The Old Documents and the New Bible. A history of the Old Testament for the people. New York: Pott, 1891. Pp. 214, 12mo, \$1.00.

Stead, W. T. The Pope and Labour. The Encyclical of Leo XIII. on the Condition of Labor, together with Letters from the Vatican, 1889. Lond.: Rev. of Rev. Off., 1891. Pp. 108, 4to, 1s.

Teutschländer, W. S. Geschichte der evangelischen Gemeinden in Rumänien mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Deutschthums. Ein Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte Rumäniens. Leipzig: Koesler, 1891. Pp. xiii., 243, 8vo, 4 mk.

Tschirn, G. Der Mensch Jesus und das historische Christenthum. Streitschrift wider die theologischen Gegner M. von Egidys. Berlin: Biblogr. Bureau, 1891. Pp. 91, 8vo, 1 mk.

Voigt, H. G. Eine verschollene Urkunde des antimonastischen Kampfes. Die Berichte des Epiphanius über die Kataphryger und Quintilianen, untersucht. Leipzig: Richter, 1891. Pp. vii., 351, 8vo, 8 mk.

Vonderhalde, E. Die Göttlichkeit Jesu Christi und der Kampf um die Geistigkeit der Religion. Leipzig: Wigand, 1891. Pp. 108, 8vo, 1 mk.

Weidner, Revere Franklin. A System of Christian Ethics. Based on Martensen and Harless. Philadelphia: Frederick, 1891. Pp. xxxii., 418, 12mo, \$2.50.

— Also Practical Theology. New York: Revell, 1891. Pp. iii., 8vo, \$1.00. Also Biblical Theology of the New Testament. Vol. II. Part III. The Pauline Teaching. Part IV. The Teaching of John. New York: Revell, 1891. Pp. viii., 351, 12mo, \$1.50.

Wiegand, Fridericus, Dr. De ecclesiae notione quid Welfi docuerit. Dissertatio Theologica. Leipzig: Faber, 1891. Pp. iii., 110, 8vo, 5 mk.

Wise, Isaac M. Pronos to Holy Writ. Establishing on documentary evidence the authorship, date, form, and contents of each of its books, and the Pentateuch. Cincinnati: Clarke, 1891. Pp. 168, 8vo, \$1.50.

Wright, L. Modern Teetotal Heresy at the Lord's Table. With observations on "The Cup of the Lord" as a great temperance question. Bristol: Wright, 1891. Pp. 79, cr. 8vo, 9d.

Zahn, Adolph, D.D. Wanderung durch Schrift und Geschichte. Aus der Zerstreuung gesammelt für Freunde und herausgegeben von einem Freundeskreise. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1891. Pp. xii., 324, 8vo, 3 mk.

CHRONICLE.

August 3. A number of bishops, clergy, and laymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the South met at Sewanee, Tenn., to consider the question of work among the colored people. The gathering was in response to action of the General Conference of 1886. Resolutions were presented expressing the appreciation of the conference of the work of the commission appointed at that time for colored people; expressed the opinion that the appointment of bishops or suffragists was inexpedient, but that archdeacons may be well selected for the special charge of the colored work in the several dioceses; expressed also satisfaction with the efforts made to represent the work in the North, and suggested the propriety of making Hoffman Hall, Nashville, Tenn., the centre of theological education among colored candidates for holy orders.

August 20. The Holy Coat was exhibited at the cathedral of Treves, Prussia, before a large concourse of pilgrims. The exhibition is to continue for two months. The average daily attendance is reported as 40 000.

August 30. A decision was rendered in regard to the long-contested equity suit between the liberal and radical factions of the United Brethren in Christ in the United States, arising out of the adoption of the new constitution of the general conference in 1889. The decision given favored the liberal party, affirming their course to be entirely legal in holding on to the property. The opposing side decided upon making an appeal to the Supreme Court.

Sept. 2. The American Sabbath Union presented a formal protest to the World's Fair Commissioners against the opening of the Fair on Sunday. The Board of Lady Managers subsequently voted 56 to 36 in favor of closing.

Sept. 4. The Catholic Congress in session at Berlin resolve that the time has come for an International Catholic Congress to consider the restoration of the temporal power of the Pope. Another congress sitting at Mechlin the following week took similar action.

Sept. 5. The Archbishop of Canterbury gave a decision in the question between Bishop Blyth and the Committee of the Church Missionary Society, which endorsed the position of the Society.

Sept. 15. Dr. Maglagaan was consecrated Archbishop of York with imposing ceremonies.

The Wesleyan Methodist Conference, which met at Nottingham, England, during the latter part of August, appointed a special committee, including a large number of the prominent members of the connection, to consider the advisability of applying to Parliament for an act giving the conference liberty of action in regard to the three-year limit of the itinerancy, and to prepare propositions to be submitted to the quarterly meetings through the year. This act is regarded by many as indicating a tendency toward the suppression of the itinerancy as a distinct element in the Wesleyan Church.

There has been considerable discussion in England and also in America during the past month with regard to the course taken by Archbishop Plunkett, of Dublin, in ordaining in his own chapel in Dublin a deacon of the so-called Reformed Episcopal Church of Portugal. Some of the High Church organs oppose the action of the Archbishop as trespassing upon relations of the Church of England to the Roman Catholic Church in Portugal, and also as endorsing certain opinions of the Reformed organization in Portugal, contrary to the doctrines of the Church of England.

The faculty of the Chicago Theological Seminary (Congregational) has been increased by three additions: the Rev. E. T. Harper, Ph.D., who is to lecture on the Old Testament in the light of Assyrian literature and history; the Rev. C. F. Gates, who will give students instruction in city mission work and in the use of the English Bible; and Dr. J. Edward Hermann, who is to have charge of the German department.

There have been continued disturbances more or less serious in China, the most serious being an attack in the city of Ichang on the premises of the Protestant Episcopal mission. No lives were lost, but the property was destroyed.

Rev. T. W. Chambers, D.D., LL.D., of New York City, will take the place of Rev. Dr. Caspar Wistar Hodge in the work of exegesis at Princeton Theological Seminary, on account of Dr. Hodge's illness.

The Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, Pa., opened with the largest attendance in its history, 65 students being present.

Both Andover and Union Theological Seminaries have opened with a largely increased body of students.

OBITUARY.

Barrows, Rev. William, D.D., at Reading, Mass., September 9, 1891, aged 76. Secretary of the Massachusetts Home Missionary Soc., and one of the founders and editors of the *Congregational Review*.

Ganse, Rev. Harvey D., D.D., at Chicago, Sept. 8, 1891, aged 69. He was Secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Aid for Colleges.

Lowell, Rev. Robert Traill Spence, D.D., at Schenectady, N. Y., Sept. 12, 1891, aged 74. He was a brother of James Russell Lowell; an Episcopalian clergyman, an author of some note, and a fine scholar.

Olmstead, Rev. John W., D.D., at Manchester, Mass., August 31, 1891, aged 75, for many years editor of the *Watchman*, Boston.

Ward, Ferdinand DeW., D.D., at Clarens, on the shores of Lake Geneva, Switzerland, Aug. 11, 1891. He was for ten years a missionary in India, but for twenty years he was a Presbyterian pastor at Genesee, N. Y.

CALENDAR.

Oct. 1. General Conference of the Evangelical Association, at Indianapolis, Ind.

Oct. 5. Meeting of the Presbytery of New York to consider the charges against Professor Briggs.

Oct. 7. (Ecumenical Methodist Conference, Washington, D. C.

Programme:

Oct. 5. Reception at New York.

Wednesday, Oct. 7, Washington. Sermon, Rev. William Arthur, M.A., England; Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

Thursday, Oct. 8. Topic: (Ecumenical Methodism; Present Status of the Eastern Section; Present Status of the Western Section.

Friday, Oct. 9. Topic: The Christian Church; its essential unity and genuine catholicity; Christian Unity; Christian Co-operation.

Saturday, Oct. 10. Topic: The Church and Scientific Thought; the influence of modern scientific progress on religious thought, the attitude of the Church toward the various phases of unbelief, the Bible in modern criticism.

Monday, Oct. 12. Topic: The Church and her Agency; the responsibility and qualification of the creature, the religious press and the religious uses of the secular press.

Tuesday, Oct. 13. Topic, continued. The Place and Power of the Lay Agency in the Church, the deaconess movement, Methodist brotherhoods and sisterhoods, woman's work in the Church.

Wednesday, Oct. 14. Topic: Education; Religious training and culture of the young, the family, Sunday-school, elementary education, how it may be best promoted, the ethics of elementary education, secularism and State education, secondary education, broadest facilities for higher education, the duty of the Church, University education.

Thursday, Oct. 15. Topic: Romanism; the present position of Romanism, Romanism as a political power, as a religious power. Topic: Temperance; the Church and the temperance reform, legal prohibition of the saloon.

Friday, Oct. 16. Topic: Social Problems; the Church in her relation to labor and capital, the moral aspects of labor combinations and strikes, the moral aspects of combinations of capital, obligations of the Church in relation to the social condition of the people, Christian work among the poor, Christian work among the rich in agricultural districts. Topic: Missions in Heathen Lands; new fields entered since 1881 in Christian lands.

Saturday, Oct. 17. Topic: War and Peace; international arbitration.

Monday, Oct. 19. Topic: The Church and Public Morality; legal restraint on the vices of society, lotteries, betting, gambling and kindred vices, marriage and divorce laws, the Lord's day, the attitude of the Church toward amusements.

Tuesday, Oct. 20. Topic: The Outlook; Christian resources of the Old World, Christian resources of the New World, the Church of the future.

Oct. 13-16. Meeting of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, Pittsfield, Mass.

Oct. 14. Consecration of the Rev. Phillips Brooks, D.D., of Boston, Mass., as Bishop of Massachusetts, at Trinity Church, Boston. Bishop John Williams, of Connecticut, will consecrate; sermon by Bishop Potter, of New York; presenters, Bishops Clark, of Rhode Island, and Whipple, of Minnesota; attending presbyters, the Rev. John Cotton Brooks, of Springfield, Mass., and the Rev. Arthur Brooks, D.D., of New York, brothers of Phillips Brooks. On the evening after the consecration there will be a reception at the house of Rev. S. S. Searing.

Oct. 30. Missionary Council of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society, Detroit, Mich.

Oct. 20. Meeting of the American Missionary Association, Cleveland, O.

Oct. 28. Consecration of Rev. I. L. Nicholson, D.D., as Bishop of Milwaukee, at St. Mark's Church, Philadelphia.

Nov. 11. Meeting of the General Missionary Committee of the Methodist Episcopal Church, at Cleveland, O.

MA

VOL. 5.

BY T

THE
dull as
discour
cially i
no reas
mon's
Christi
which
not pos
matter
the he
regard
suits a
tunity
speaks
of are
combi
listen
and r
not, a
yet on
upon
which
to at a

It
access
of th
regar
tive n
religi
lower
of th
light
dows
pasor
prays
as to
origi
men
mini
stan
and
affili